

Item: Senate Minutes, February 2007
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for February 2007. 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, February 12, 2007, at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Peter M. Butler in the chair were the following: Barker, Breckenridge, Camfield, Chowdhury, Cochrane, Cook, Croll, Edelstein, Fraser, Haslam, Hicks, Jones, Kesselring, Khimji, Klein, Leon, LoRusso, Maes, McNeil, Mukhida, Nowakowski, Pegg, Persaud, Plug, Poulton, Saunders, Scrimger, Shaver, Sheng, Simmonds, Singleton, Slonim, Spence Wach, Sullivan, Sutow, Swanston, Taylor, Tindall, Tipping, Traves, Wallace, Watters, Whyte.

Regrets: Adshade, Binkley, Bodorik, Cleave, Dunphy, El-Hawary, El-Masry, Geldenhuys, Grundy, Helland, McConnell, McLarney, Moukdad, Schroeder, Smith, Wanzel, Wheeler.

Absent: Allen, Gray, Hubert, Johnson, Lane, Pelzer, Precious, Rutherford, Scherkoske, Webster, Yeung.

Invitees: K. Burt, A. Power, M. Roughneen, T. Vinci, S. Zinck

2007:14

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was **ADOPTED** as circulated.

2007:15

Draft Minutes of January 22, 2007 Meeting

2.1 Approval

The minutes were **APPROVED** with the addition of one sentence to page 5, line 3 – “The President clarified that it is not the Board’s intention to reduce graduate enrolments.”

2.2 Matters Arising

A report from the Senate Discipline Committee and the Senate Discipline Working Committee will be presented at the February 26, 2007 Senate meeting. There were no further matters arising.

2007:16

Question Period

Mr. Tipping inquired if there was a specific dictionary by which one is to interpret the by-laws of Senate and asked which dictionary this was. Ms. Power indicated she would email the name of the dictionary to Mr. Tipping.

Mr. Whyte stated that a couple of years ago, in response to a question about parking, it turned out that the Senate representative on the Parking Committee was actually not a member of Senate. He asked if Senate would seek some clarification as to how that could be, and how that position operated, and whether or not that person would report to Senate from time to time. He asked that Senate have answers to these questions at the next meeting. The Chair agreed to provide answers at the next meeting of Senate.

2007:17

Budget Advisory Committee Report XXXIV

The Budget Advisory Committee Report XXXIV was introduced by Mr. Shaver, Chair of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). Mr. Shaver invited members of Senate to ask questions following his introduction. Mr. Shaver started on page 19 of the Report where the descriptions of general fee increases of 3.9 and other fee increases for other students are presented. Page 6 reflects a radical change in the plan as a result of discussions with the provincial government with a hope that commitments to fund the allowed fee increases that were in the last year of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the provincial government would be implemented. Mr. Shaver recalled that the government spoke of reducing both fee increases and tuition fees. The government has re-opened the third year of the MOU and started to negotiate certain increases in its transfers to the universities. Page 6 shows the final year MOU 4.48% is assumed to be included in revenue in lieu of the fee increases; \$3.5 million would fund a tuition fee reduction of \$4.2 million, page 19 shows that the Operating Grant is \$123 million because of the increased transfers from the government and on page 6 it is now \$130 million. Tuition income would be reduced in its calculation. The remaining estimates continue to be the same on the two pages, and so this is simply substituting the government money for the external revenue. There is also an allocation for a student enrolment decline which is based on projections over three-year averages and also flow-through numbers. Even though the entering class size went up last year, there is still flow through from the grade 13 double cohort and other reasons which tends to bring our enrolment down. Part of that \$125M is also a result of decline in graduate enrolment. As a result, it is assumed there will be a revenue reduction. Included in the Report there is also an allocation for strategic priorities of \$3.8 million. The sum results in a shortfall of \$3.5 million on the bottom line. Page 4 and 5 describe the balancing of that 3.5 million dollar shortfall. He indicated unit budget reductions are one way of balancing the budget and finding the \$3.5 million.

Mr. Butler reminded Senators that some members of the BAC were present for the discussions: Mr. Ken Burt, Vice-President, Finance and Administration, Mr. Tom Vinci, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences representative, Mr. Michael Roughneen, Assistant Vice-President, Personnel Services, Mr. Keith Taylor, Dean of Science as well as a resource person, Ms. Susan Zinck.

Mr. Cook said that it seems that the key element with the assumptions is that once more reductions at the unit level are the only way to balance the operating budget. Mr. Cook inquired if other considerations had been given for the \$3.5 million? Mr. Shaver said that two other possible models were discussed - not to invest in strategic initiatives or seek more revenue. It was considered unwise not to invest in strategic initiatives as it was felt that these items have a significant affect on enrolment, recruiting, and also on the education of our students. Also, there was a feeling that if we invest wisely we may end up with greater revenue down the road.

Mr. Slonim asked if any consideration had been given to faculties that are currently in a deficit if they could be excluded from the unit budget reduction. Mr. Shaver stated that this was not considered. Mr. Slonim observed that the deficit would increase. Mr. Shaver indicated that BAC will take every step it can to help faculties balance their budget.

Mr. Edelstein stated that he knows the government is definitely committed to deficit reduction and inquired if the University has had any discussions about funding the proposed increase of 3.6% to a 9.9% increase. If there have been discussions, have they been in the context of the 3.9% and the increases for all the professional programs, or for just the general 3.9%? Mr. Shaver said that communications with the government have been at a general level and the government has indicated that it will be calling a meeting sometime in February where this issue will be discussed further. However, for operating purposes, BAC has assumed that normal increases will be covered, but this is not certain at this time.

Mr. Leon inquired if increases in revenue were considered to balance the budget. Mr. Shaver stated that the budget could be balanced if we got more revenue. However, he observed that so far there has not been an obvious answer, other than increasing enrolment and that will not happen for this budget period.

Mr. Edelstein asked if CONSUP has decided who will be representing the universities in those negotiations. Mr. Traves noted that the Chair of CONSUP was present at the Senate meeting, Mr. Philip Hicks, President of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College, and Mr. Shaver and Dr. Colin Dodd's of St. Mary's University are the other representatives.

Mr. Pegg asked a question relating to the fact that page 18 shows the impact of a 1% budget reduction on the various units. His concern was that the faculties have more difficulty in finding additional revenue, yet some of these budgetary units could deal with their savings by simply downloading to the faculties. An example would be if we look at the Secretary of Senate who would have to save \$2000 in the next budget year. Last year they decided to no longer send out printed a meeting package which downloads the printing cost to the unit level. What will be put in place to ensure that these other units don't simply recover their budget costs by downloading to the faculties? Mr. Traves noted that Dalhousie University is a large institution with many hundreds of budget lines and are not going to be able to track everyone. However, the principle of downloading costs is accepted as part of the budget practice, certainly to the extent that we become aware of it and we would assume that anyone who does it would make us aware of it, and the University would prohibit that kind of activity.

Mr. Whyte asked if there is ever any way in which reduction in enrolment starts to result in a reduction of expenditure. Mr. Shaver said that conceivably, if we were to follow through and not have a University at all, then there would be no costs, but that is not the purpose of the institution. Mr. Whyte clarified by saying he was thinking of support staff somewhere. If you have reduced number of students, there must be a time when something is operating at a lower capacity and/or require less staffing. Mr. Shaver noted that in his career he has seen the level of accountability, the level of service demanded, the quality of that service demanded constantly being increased, and he thinks that some of the actual costs might be reduced, but the demands on increased service, in many different ways, are escalating enormously. When we look at the balancing of the budget, and we see things like spending on student services which certainly are not a really outlandish expenditure compared to our peer groups, one might have to think about that issue even if we had fewer students. He suggested in all likelihood we could still be spending more on student services.

Mr. Butler reminded Senators that there is an invitation for members of the University to provide comments on the Budget Advisory Committee Report XXXIV directly to Susan Zinck at susan.zinck@dal.ca.

2007:18

Senate Nominating Committee: Senate Standing Committee Member Vote

Senator Butler indicated that there is one additional nomination for the Nova Scotia Agricultural College Faculty Council from the Senate Nominating Committee which will be presented today in addition to the two nominations circulated with the agenda.

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Butler **MOVED**:

THAT Melanie Farrimond, College of Continuing Education, be nominated to the Senate Library Committee for the term February 13, 2007 – June 30, 2007; and

THAT Mr. Blyth Archibald, Faculty of Management, be nominated to the Senate Discipline Committee for the term February 13, 2007 – June 30, 2008; and

THAT Mr. Rob Jamieson, Faculty of Engineering, be nominated to the Nova Scotia Agricultural College Faculty Council for the term February 13, 2007 – June 30, 2008.

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the three nominees were declared elected to their respective committees.

2007:19

In Camera - Honorary Degrees Committee -Voting on Honorary Degree Candidates, Spring 2008

The assembly went in camera to consider and vote on the slate of honorary degree candidates following which the assembly returned to open session. The Vice Chair reported that all eight candidates nominated had been approved.

2007:20

Chair's Report

There was no report from the Chair.

2007:21

President's Report

Mr. Traves inform Senators that the University has received a major International Facilities award from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) to support the Ocean Tracking Network. Dalhousie University has received an award of \$35,000,000 from CFI, and in addition up to \$10 million from NSERC toward this project. This is a huge investment by the government, a major science project at Dalhousie involving university partners across the country at other Canadian universities and international partners in about 14 or 15 different countries. The project involves the use of a Nova Scotia developed, but originally Dalhousie developed technology, which will track marine species, look at the impact of climate change on the ocean and the impact of those changes on a variety of species through a series of sensors put out across the ocean floor. A large number of fish species will be tagged and as fish swim throughout all of the world's oceans they are registered as they pass through. This is a huge project and a wonderful tribute to the work of the scientific team led by Professor Ron O'Dor of the Faculty of Science with colleagues in Science, Law, and Arts and Social Sciences at Dalhousie University and colleagues around the world. At the announcement in the morning, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of ACOA, members of the provincial government and the Presidents of CFI and NSERC were all present. This project will position Dalhousie in a global sense in terms of the importance of this project. That has implications for us, not only in terms of the research projects involved directly, but in terms of the University's reputation for scientific and research excellence.

Mr. Traves reported that the Brain Repair Centre, which was approved as a university research centre at the October 23, 2006 meeting of Senate, received in the last CFI competition, a grant of \$5.5 million, submitted by a team led by Professor Robert Brownstone, to essentially facilitate the internal fittings of a significant portion of our planned Life Sciences Research Institute Building. This \$5.5 million will be matched by the Nova Scotia Research and Innovation Trust which will facilitate the construction of this building.

Mr. Traves noted that the Dalhousie Student Union (DSU) will be conducting a referendum on the improved student space issue at Dalhousie. Students will be asked if they agree to contribute a significant range of projects through a \$10 per course ancillary fee that will commence in 2009. By that time we would have completed the construction of the various projects that have been outlined for students. The referendum will be held on March 6 and 7 through a DSU referendum online ballot. In the event the referendum is successful, the University will proceed to borrow \$25 million, to be repaid over an extended period of time out of the funds secured through this auxiliary fee. It is hoped that the students will vote to endorse this initiative. However, in the event that they do not vote to endorse all the projects so we will unfortunately have to go on the shelf, and it will be a long time until we are in a position to fund them out of our own university-based resources. Mr. Traves noted it is an important initiative and he very much appreciates the

work of the DSU in terms of organizing an extended discussion about this topic and their cooperation in organizing the referendum.

Mr. Taylor spoke to the project known as the Ocean Tracking Network stating that Mr. Tillotson, the President of CFI, had advised that for Canadian CFI awards there have only been three that were larger than this one; the Canadian Light Source at the University of Saskatchewan, the award for High Performance Computing, and the Sudbury Neutrino Laboratory. The Ocean Tracking Network project is the largest award to a single university, although we have partners at other universities. He noted that this project represents a monumental success for our marine biologists, who are the strongest group in the world, in Marine Biology.

2007:22

Other Business

There were no items of other business.

2007:23

Adjournment

Mr. Slonim **MOVED**, seconded by Mr. Jones:

THAT the Senate meeting be adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Secretary

Chair

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

Approved Minutes of Senate Meeting

Senate met in regular session on Monday, February 26, 2007, at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Mo El-Hawary in the chair were the following: Barker, Bodorik, Breckenridge, Chowdhury, Cleave, Cochrane, Cook, Croll, Dunphy (Recording Secretary), Edelstein, El-Masry, Fraser, Geldenhuys, Grundy, Haslam, Helland, Jones, Khimji, Klein, LoRusso, Maes, McConnell, McLarney, McNeil, Moukdad, Nowakowski, Persaud, Poulton, Scherkoske, Schroeder, Scrimger, Shaver, Simmonds, Singleton, Slonim, Smith, Spence Wach, Sutow, Swanston, Taylor, Tindall, Tipping, Traves, Wallace, Watters, Wheeler, Whyte.

Regrets: Allen, Binkley, Butler, Camfield, Hicks, Kesselring, Leon, Pegg, Saunders, Sheng.

Absent: Adshade, Gray, Hubert, Johnson, Lane, Mukhida, Pelzer, Plug, Precious, Rutherford, Sullivan, Wanzel, Webster, Yeung.

Invitees: E. Duggan, C. Gustow, W. Hankey, T.L. Maloney, K. McKeigan, A. Power, M. Trudum.

2007:24

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was **ADOPTED** as circulated.

2007:25

Draft Minutes of February 12, 2007 Meeting

2.1 Approval

With the following two edits the minutes were **APPROVED** as circulated.

1. 2007:17 Budget Advisory Committee Report XXXIV – page 3, 4th paragraph – the second last line should read “When we look at the balancing of the budget, and we see things like spending on student services which certainly are not a really outlandish expenditure compared to our peer groups, one might have to think about that issue even if we had fewer students.”
2. 2007:21 President’s Report – ‘Nutrino’ should be spelt ‘Neutrino’.

2.2 Matters Arising

The approval of the *Draft Faculty Discipline Procedures Concerning Academic Dishonesty* document will not be on the agenda as previously discussed. Mr. Dunphy indicated that Constitutional changes will also be required in addition to certain committees reviewing the document prior to a review by Senate. This will happen within the next few months. Mr. El-Hawary confirmed that the Gage Dictionary of Canadian English is the dictionary to be used in the preparation of official University documents. Mr. Whyte had a question about Senate representation on the University Parking Committee. He understood that this member was not a member of Senate and asked if Senate would seek some clarification as to how that could be; how that position operated, and whether or not that person would report to Senate from time to time. Mr. El-Hawary explained that the terms of reference and membership of that committee state that “there will be three representatives named by Senate one of whom shall be a member of the Senate Physical Planning Committee”. Therefore, it is clear that these members are named by Senate. Currently, there is one representative from Medicine and Microbiology, Ms. Lois Murray. There

are two vacancies and the Senate Nominating Committee has been informed of these vacancies. Mr. El-Hawary indicated that it was his understanding that one of the three representatives would be updating Senate on committee activities that would be of interest to Senate.

2007:26

Question Period

Mr. Tipping informed Mr. El-Hawary that several student Senators will not be able to attend the March 12, 2007 meeting of Senate where the Senate Discipline Working Group's report and recommendations will be considered and asked if it would be possible to consider moving that item to the following meeting to ensure students who serve on the SDC may be able to attend and comment. Mr. Dunphy explained that this item will now be first considered by the Senate Committee on Academic Administration and Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee and will therefore not come to Senate for the March 12, 2007 meeting; however, the item would have been deferred at Mr. Tipping's request.

2007:27

Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee (SAPBC)

a. Senate Reviews of Faculties: Revisions to the Terms of Reference and Schedule

Mr. Larry Maloney, Associate Vice-President, Academic was invited to speak to this item and he explained that the proposed changes to the terms of reference are minor and address the section where Senate reviews come before Senate. Each review will now come forward to Senate for discussion as opposed to only coming before SAPBC with a copy of that material being forwarded to the Senate Office for review. Mr. Maloney explained that the Schedule of Reviews typically attempted to match up the termination of the Deans' terms to completion of the review report. Unfortunately, this was an impractical expectation as the reviews would then be really only a three and a half year cycle by the time the report is received. Also, trying to schedule the reviews in concert with Deans' terms of office is impractical because it is not assured that the Faculty Review will always be on time and there have been times where Deans' have left their position prior to completion of their term. There are also workload problems here as a five-year review cycle puts a tremendous load on the Faculties in terms of writing self-study reports, the Office of the Senate, and Mr. Maloney's office in terms of getting committees to do the reviews. A seven-year cycle is proposed which will give Faculties a bit more time to respond to the recommendations in reports, and it spreads out the cost of these reviews in a more acceptable manner.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED:**

THAT the Senate approve the revised Procedures and Terms of Reference for Senate Reviews of Faculties and the revised schedule for Senate Reviews of Faculties.

Mr. Maloney reminded Senate that the practice at SAPBC has been to approve a schedule of reviews for a three-year period and this would be re-affirmed each year at the committee.

The motion **CARRIED**.

b. Senate Reviews of Centres and Institutes: Terms of Reference and Long-Term Schedule

Mr. Maloney reported that prior to 2003 reviews of Senate-approved Institutes and Centres was the responsibility of Senate and was housed in the previous terms of reference for Senate Reviews of Faculties. In 2003, when the terms of reference for the Senate Reviews of Faculties were revised, it was intentionally indicated that the Reviews of Centres and Institutes would be conducted by the

Faculties in which they were housed. Unfortunately, there were no terms of reference and it was determined, in consultation with the Vice-Chair of Senate and Vice-President, Research, that a schedule (seven year cyclical program) and terms of reference were required for the review of Senate-Approved Centres and Institutes.

THAT the Senate approve the Procedures and Terms of Reference for Senate Reviews of Centres and Institutes and the schedule for Senate Reviews of Centres and Institutes.

Mr. Cook inquired if the actual review process itself could take anywhere from 16 to 20 months. Mr. Maloney responded that that sort of timetable was copied out of the Senate Review of Faculties; however, many of the reviews of Senate Centres and Institutes could be confined to a shorter period than 18 months.

The motion **CARRIED**.

c. New Program Proposal: Bachelor of Arts in Music (20 credit)

Mr. David Schroeder, Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, was invited to speak to this item.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED**:

THAT the Senate approve the new program proposal for a Bachelor of Arts in Music (20 credit).

Mr. Schroeder explained that Senate had recently approved a new program in Music, an Honors B.A. in Music. At the same time, there was a modification to the Bachelor of Music, and the termination of the 15-credit B.A. This proposal for the 20-credit B.A. should have come forward at that same time, but it did not as there was an element of confusion about whether or not it had already been approved. When it became clear that it had not come forward, a proposal was prepared.

The motion **CARRIED**.

d. Modified Program Proposal: B.Sc. Double Major in Creative Writing & B.Sc. Combined Honors in Creative Writing

Mr. David Schroeder, Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences was invited to speak to this item.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED**:

THAT the Senate approve the modified program proposals for the Bachelor of Science Double Major in Creative Writing and B.Sc. Combined Honors in Creative Writing.

Mr. David Schroeder explained that a year ago Senate approved the program in Creative Writing, but it was in the Bachelor of Arts only. The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences had hoped to do the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science together, but, because of time constraints only the Bachelor of Arts went ahead. There has now been time to consult with the Faculty of Science and they have given their support for the program.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

e. Comparative Religion

- I. Name Change: Comparative Religion to Religious Studies
 - a) B.A. (15 credit) with concentration in Comparative Religion to B.A. (15 credit) with Concentration in Religious Studies
 - b) B.A. (20 credit) with major in Comparative Religion to B.A. (20 credit) with major in Religious Studies
 - c) B.Sc. (20 credit) Double Major, second subject in Comparative Religion to B.Sc. (20 credit) Double Major, second subject in Religious Studies
- II. Department of Comparative Religion changed to Religious Studies Program embedded within the Department of Classics
- III. Modified Program Proposals: Religious Studies
 - a) B.A. (20 credit) Combined Honors in Religious Studies and another subject
 - b) B.Sc. (20 credit) Combined Honors, second subject in Religious Studies

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED**:

THAT the Senate approve the modified program proposal for:

- a) **Name change - Comparative Religion to Religious Studies**
 - a. **B.A. (15 credit) with concentration in Comparative Religion to B.A. (15 credit) with concentration in Religious Studies**
 - b. **B.A. (20 credit) with major in Comparative Religion to B.A. (20 credit) with major in Religious Studies**
 - c. **B.Sc. (20 credit) Double Major, second subject in Comparative Religion to B.Sc. (20 credit) Double Major, second subject in Religious Studies**
- b) **Department of Comparative Religion changed to Religious Studies Program embedded within the Department of Classics.**
- c) **Modified Program Proposals:**
 - i. **B.A. (20 credit) Combined Honors in Religious Studies and another subject**
 - ii. **B.Sc. (20 credit) Combined Honors, second subject in Religious Studies**

Mr. David Schroeder and Mr. Wayne Hankey were invited to speak to this item. Mr. Schroeder stated that he would like to address some of the points that were raised in the rebuttal presented by the Comparative Religion Society. A program in religion has been offered by Dalhousie University for approximately 30 years. Up until 1989 Dalhousie University had a Department of Religion and at that time it changed its name to the Department of Comparative Religion with two tenured-faculty members. In 2003 both faculty members left the University and it was not possible to continue with a department that small. The Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences (FASS) started to look for a way to create a structure that would allow religion to continue to be offered and different options were explored; including being part of a larger inter-disciplinary unit, but that proved not to be viable. FASS opted to have religion placed within another department which has been an option for other programs (Italian Studies program within the Department of French). However, placing Religious Studies within Classics does not imply that the study of Religion will become a branch of classics, but rather it is an administrative solution to solving an issue of a very small program.

In 2003, admissions to the degree program in Religion were suspended and in order to lift that suspension an administrative structure must be in place in order to reinstate the program. FASS hoped to hire two full-time members in Religion; one would be an expert in either Islam or Judaism both areas. The other faculty member would be a specialist in Asian Religions. Mr. Schroeder mentioned that student enrolments are very strong in the Religion program.

Mr. Schroeder explained that in relation to the name change, FASS has opted for Religious Studies, which is more encompassing than Comparative Religion as the latter name has a very specific methodological

association which can be more confining. He indicated that there is some confusion about the inclusion of Theology and he wanted to reiterate that in no way will this program become a program in Theology. That term did appear in the proposal but that is not the intended direction and there is already a program of Theology in Halifax. The program will have a certain amount of cross-listing with other departments in the Faculty (Sociology and Social Anthropology and History) and this was not possible prior to 2003.

Mr. Schroeder reported that there was consultation with all the other religion departments within the Maritimes and lengthy replies were received from two departments and a very short reply from one other. The proposal and consultations have taken four years and this was not an easy process. The Academic Development Committee (ADC) of FASS was behind the restructuring and they created a sub-committee which produced the report for ADC. The report was then taken to the Faculty for approval. Mr. Hankey was a member of that sub-committee and the Chair of the ADC at that time. Mr. Hankey spoke to the consultations which took place, and stated that there was a student member on ADC throughout the process and when the sub-committee was established there was an advertisement within the Faculty and the student newspaper about the consultations with an invitation to everyone to participate. After the consultations, the matter went to ADC and then was discussed in the Faculty more than once. The Faculty also has student representation, so the possibility for student input was present all along. Mr. Schroeder added that in that four-year period, because of the suspension, FASS has been in a holding pattern and have been making limited term appointments in Comparative Religion. It is important for this proposal to be approved so that FASS can move on to the next step and make tenure-track appointments in Religious Studies.

Mr. Slonim questioned why Christianity was not taught at the University in addition to the other two religions. Mr. Hankey responded by saying that the change from Comparative Religion to Religious Studies was to ensure the whole program was wider and more inclusive utilizing scarce resources. Currently, there are a number of courses within the Faculty which include a great deal of teaching about Christianity. Using our current resources in conjunction with the new appointments will ensure that FASS offers an expanded program.

Mr. Tindall inquired whether, in the course of the process of development of the proposal and the consultations, if the Comparative Religion Society was specifically asked to comment? Mr. Hankey indicated that he was not aware that the Society existed at the time the consultations took place and the consultations were made widely-known both in the University and within the Department of Comparative Religion. Invitations were extended, people did appear; and a response from the student representative on the ADC was given. Mr. Tipping requested clarification as to whether there was no student from the Department in Comparative Religion who participated in these discussions. Mr. Tipping also inquired about the future of the department both academically and administratively.

Mr. Schroeder responded that FASS was not aware at the time that there was a Society when this proposal started. Because of the various invitations that did go out, and because of student involvement with steps along the way, it certainly would have been possible for there to be that kind of input had the Society existed. Mr. Schroeder noted that he had spent about an hour and a half with the Society approximately a month ago and tried to answer all their questions. As far as where this program is going this could be viewed in a number of ways as there is great potential for growth. If student numbers increased then so could the number of faculty members and the unit could at some point, once again, become a department.

Ms. Chantal Gustow, Vice-President, Comparative Religion Society, spoke to the student involvement in the process. The Comparative Religion Society has been a DSU ratified society for many years (prior to the 2003/04 ratification of the proposal) and she stated that they were not consulted. The main issue for the Society is that there has not been ongoing student involvement in the development of the proposal. The Society met with Dr. Schroeder about a month ago as they did not know what was happening. In regard to Theology, the proposal does say Religious Studies can focus on the Theological method as well. The Society does not have a problem with changing the name of the department from Comparative Religion to Religious Studies, but they do feel that including this in the proposal represents a basic misunderstanding of what it is

that happens within the Comparative Religion Department. The inclusion of Theology is very much Christian-centered and this could decrease the variety that currently exists within the program. Ms. Gustow believes that the proposal under-estimates the importance that Religious Studies has within the University. The comments indicate that graduate studies under-estimate the fact that this is a very important scholarly activity because you can go on to become a social worker or a developmental worker and the proposal needs to be more inclusive so that we can better represent what our goals are as students. Mr. Schroeder addressed the question regarding graduate studies, and noted that within a small department it is difficult to prepare students in every possible way for graduate studies. Potentially when there are more faculty members, it could be possible to expand in a way that would allow FASS to create an honours program and items required for students going on to a graduate program. That is not to say that students will not go on to graduate programs from this program, rather, we hope that we can expand in ways that will allow that to become better.

Ms. Emily Duggan, President, Comparative Religion Society, stated she wished to speak to the concerns of the direction of the program that is proposed as she is of the opinion that embedding the Religious Studies program within Classics will influence the objectives of the Classics Department. Ms. Duggan also said she would like to talk to the misunderstandings and a lot of the communication problems that the Society has experienced in their program. They have had some difficulties with the current majors who are in the department who have been admitted into the program, and there have been some concerns with the communication between the Registrar's Office and the department. Students were able to sign up for the Religious Studies program and then were informed that they should have seen that they could not take the degree when there was a group who was able to get the degree. Ms. Duggan also spoke to the statistics that have been proposed with the new program, as she is of the opinion that the numbers included seem to be much lower than what they actually are this year and the program has been expanding over the past two years.

Mr. Edelstein noted an apparent misunderstanding between the Faculty and the students and he believes that this needs to be dealt with in some manner. The University, to a large extent, exists to serve the students that come here and he thinks that there is a good argument to be made that Senators should perhaps defer the approval of this until the next meeting so that there can be some consultation with the students in the program. Mr. Edelstein also inquired if any of the faculty or the two people that had been working there under contract for the last few years were consulted.

Mr. Schroeder commented that even though this program will be in Classics it will not be shaped and become part of Classics. It will remain the independent study of Religion. In terms of making an appointment we would expect to get candidates who are specialists in Central Asian religions or Eastern Asian religions, and those will all be considered at the time. On the matter of majors, this will be left for the Registrar to respond. In terms of statistics the ratios turn out to be very good, which demonstrates that the study of Religion is a very great interest to our students and many students are taking our religion classes. Mr. Schroeder said he would be concerned about deferring the vote on this as FASS have been dealing with this for a very long time and cannot make tenured-track appointments in Religion until the proposal is approved.

Mr. Whyte called for a point of order stating that it was not clear to him that Mr. Edelstein had actually proposed a motion of deferral or postponement or a motion to refer and he did not know whether it was seconded. Mr. El-Hawary stated that there was no motion made and Mr. Edelstein will wait to make the motion.

Mr. Traves stated that a unit of two people is not a department as it is too small and not sustainable which leaves us with the question: "Do you want to have the study of religion in the University in a programmatic degree based way, and if you do, what is going to be the appropriate organizational framework within which to pursue that study?" Historically, a number of years ago the department functioned with a somewhat narrow focus. What is being presented here is a much broader focus that brings to bear the interests and

expertise of scholars in a variety disciplines, and we are creating an organizational framework to sustain this in terms of formal study. If the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences had some inclusive catch all unit the program would be part of that unit; however, in the absence of that it seems logical for this to go into Classics. This area could also go into Philosophy but ultimately it must go somewhere. Historically, Religion has frequently attracted reasonable numbers of students into courses, but has very few graduates and few people majored in the area. The pattern of enrolments shows that the first and second year courses seem to be reasonably well subscribed versus the upper level courses, which speaks to the sustainability of the program, and the non-sustainability of a department. Mr. Traves stated that rather than hold this process up and hold up the prospect of getting tenure-stream appointments in this area, Senate should encourage the Faculty to enhance the study of religion at the University, through the only plausible vehicle before us.

Mr. Hankey seconded the remarks of the President and wanted to address the proposed relation between Religion and Classics. One of the reasons that the negotiation between the Dean's Office and the ADC took two years with Classics was precisely that Classics did not want the two things mixed up together and Classics do not want to produce a joint program in Classics and Religious Studies. One of the reasons that Classics was suggested is that we do have some expertise in the study of religion; however, we do not intend to restrict it, rather we want it to grow.

Mr. Edelstein **MOVED**, seconded by Mr. Tindall:

THAT Senate defer the vote for section II - Department of Comparative Religion changed to Religious Studies Program embedded within the Department of Classics until the Senate meeting on March 12th, 2007.

Mr. Traves said that for the past three years this University has been making a concerted effort to increase the experience that students have and he thinks that this is a prime example of how we can do that. It would only be fair to allow those students to have a discussion with the Faculty about what degree they will be getting from this University. Mr. Traves was confident that this discussion can easily happen in the next two weeks and it is not entirely unreasonable, after waiting for four years, to wait an additional two weeks in order to bring this matter to Senate. Mr. Tipping felt that the Comparative Religion Society simply wanted to be part of any discussion about their education and he believes that postponing this for two weeks, and having that kind of informal consultation will solve a lot of these problems. Mr. Matt Trudum, Comparative Religion, History major, spoke against the motion, as he felt that by providing only two weeks to meet and discuss this topic was not a fair amount of time. Ms. Kate McKeigan, Treasurer, Comparative Religion Society, stated that the Society really only wants to be involved in this conversation. Mr. Schroeder added that recently he sent an email to the Society inviting them to meet either himself or Dean Binkley. The offer was declined; however, if the Society would like a couple more weeks for discussion he would be in favor of the motion.

The motion **CARRIED**.

Mr. Dunphy **MOVED** to amend the main motion by removing section II from the motion, seconded by Mr. Fraser:

THAT the Senate approve the modified program proposal for:

- a) **Name change - Comparative Religion to Religious Studies**
 - b. **B.A. (15 credit) with concentration in Comparative Religion to B.A. (15 credit) with concentration in Religious Studies**
 - c. **B.A. (20 credit) with major in Comparative Religion to B.A. (20 credit) with major in Religious Studies**
 - d. **B.Sc. (20 credit) Double Major, second subject in Comparative Religion to B.Sc. (20 credit) Double Major, second subject in Religious Studies**
- b) **Modified Program Proposals:**
 - i. **B.A. (20 credit) Combined Honors in Religious Studies and another subject**

ii. B.Sc. (20 credit) Combined Honors, second subject in Religious Studies

The amended motion **CARRIED**.

2007:28

Chair's Report

Mr. El-Hawary reported that he and the Registrar had signed off on the awarding of a Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science.

Mr. Slonim **MOVED**:

THAT Senate affirm the awarding of a Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science previously approved by the Chair of Senate on behalf of the Senate, and the Registrar of Dalhousie University, in consultation with the Deans of Computer Science and Graduate Studies, and as identified in the correspondence to the members of Senate.

Mr. Tindall inquired why this awarding was being done at this time. Mr. Traves responded that he believed it was a matter of illness and there were time constraints.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. El-Hawary further reported that there have been discussions between the President and the Officers of Senate concerning the structure of the administrative support for Senate and the Board of Governors. Mr. El-Hawary said that he was pleased to report that an Office of the University Secretariate will be established for Dalhousie University which will provide the administrative support for both the Senate and the Board, establishing additional efficiencies and effectiveness and bringing it in line with current practices with other Canadian universities. The Director of the University Secretariate will report to both the Chair of the Board and the Chair of Senate. Mr. Traves further outlined that a new University Secretary has been hired and the Board had completely reorganized its own administrative affairs and its own Constitution. In addition to Board and Senate matters, if there were administrative needs in the University related to the governance and legislation, we would now have a body which could be assigned responsibilities in that regard.

2007:29

President's Report

Mr. Traves indicated that he had three areas to speak to and the first one was to report on the ongoing development of the University Budget and the Budget Advisory Committee Report. Depending on the current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) there could be some possibility that, based on a variety of provincial government pronouncements, there would be a substantial increase in funding for the University through the Operating Grant. This is ultimately related to tuition increases, with a view to reducing tuition in each university in the province. Mr. Traves reported that a discussion group has been struck consisting of three university Presidents (Mr. Traves is one), three representatives of the two organizations that represent students in Nova Scotia, and two Dalhousie students are among those three students that are represented, and three Deputy Ministers to look at this question. This group met last week and the discussion was laid out similar to the Budget Advisory Committee document. Mr. Traves indicated that the final decision will turn on the measures that will be brought forward in the federal government budget, which is anticipated to be announced on March 19th. The federal government makes substantial transfers to the province and if the transfers are sufficient, the province of Nova Scotia will then be in a position to have the resources to carry forward. If the transfers do not materialize, or they're insufficient, then they will be in a position where it will be difficult. The discussion group will consult with the province about which path they will follow; the old MOU or the proposed increased funding MOU.

The second point is the Board's discussion at its meeting last week of the Long-term Financial Planning Committee's Report. This document came before Senate for discussion and a number of issues were raised. All comments were forwarded to the Board. The Board approved the recommendations as drafted in that report; however, the Board was very mindful of the fact that some concerns existed, particularly with respect to questions related to graduate studies. There was a question of how we interpret what the Board is doing and Mr. Traves provided clarification, once again, that there was no intention to cut back in some dramatic fashion on graduate studies at Dalhousie, but rather from a financial perspective the Board hoped to see a growth in undergraduate enrolment over time. Mr. Traves reported that there were a handful of other issues that were raised in the discussion; some of which related to Engineering and it is Mr. Traves' intention in cooperation with the Chair of that committee, Dr. Spatz, to draft a brief note of clarification on some of the questions that were raised and circulate those to the University community.

Finally, Mr. Traves announced that there is a new publication on campus called DN, short for *Dalhousie News*, which has been an online publication for the last couple of years. *Dalhousie News* online will continue; however, the Department of Communications and Marketing has determined that a paper version (not exactly the same version) will be reported in a paper form. Mr. Tindall inquired about the mode of distribution of DN. Mr. Traves presumed it would be distributed in a similar manner to the student newspaper.

Mr. Traves also reported that Dr. David Precious, Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, was recently made a member of the Order of Canada and he extended his congratulations.

2007:30

Other Business

There were no other matters of business.

2007:31

Adjournment

Mr. Cochrane **MOVED**, seconded by Mr. Slonim:

THAT the Senate meeting be adjourned.

The motion **CARRIED**.