

Item: Senate Minutes, November 2000

Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5 Accession 2007-039 Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for November 2000. 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, November 20, 2000, at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, MacDonald Building.

Present with Mr. C. Stuttard in the chair were the following:

Alexander, Ben-Abdallah, Binkley, Bleasdale, Blunden, Bradfield, Breckenridge, Brett, Caley, Cochrane, Coté, Cox, Cunningham, Downe-Wamboldt, El-Hawary, Farrell, Guppy, Harvey, Ipson, Johnston, Kay-Raining Bird, Lee, MacAulay, B. MacDonald, N. MacDonald, MacLean, McGrath, McIntyre, Murphy, Pacey, Rowe, Rutherford, Sastri, Savoy, Scott, Scully, Tindall, Traves, Ugursal, Watters, Whyte.

Regrets: Connolly, Devlin, Girard, Kemp, Kimmins, Lohmann, R. MacDonald, MacInnis, Neves, Phillips, Russell, Slonim, Starnes.

**2000:128.**

Adoption of Agenda

Item 5 became item 3, and the subsequent items were renumbered accordingly. The agenda was then **ADOPTED** as amended.

**2000:129.**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Mr. Scully did not recall the consensus at SAPBC to which the minutes referred at **2000:125**, page 11, line 9. Ms. Bleasdale agreed with Mr. Scully that there had been no consensus on the matter in question at the October 2, 2000 SAPBC meeting; however, these minutes accurately reflected Mr. Bradfield's comments at Senate.

Mr. Whyte requested that for greater clarity the minutes include the complete text of the amended motion in **2000:127**. With this addition, the minutes of the meeting of October 30, 2000, were **ADOPTED** as amended.

**2000:130.**

Scholarship Notifications

Mr. Traves reported that the Registrar shared the concerns of Senators over the late date by which students were being notified of the receipt of in-course scholarships. The Registrar's Office was

reviewing the problems posed by the need to include any summer school grades in the calculation of a student's grade point average. Options for determining scholarship eligibility more expeditiously would be considered by SCAA then forwarded to Senate.

**2000:131.**

Banner Project Information

In response to Mr. Bradfield's question at the previous meeting concerning the number of individuals still working on Banner updates, changes, and implementation modules, Mr. Scully reported that 32.5 individuals were currently working full-time on the Banner Implementation Project: 3 on Project Management, Integration and Support; 1 on the Degree Audit System; 4 on the Human Resources System; 4.5 on the Alumni Development System; 8 on the Financial Information System; and 12 providing technical expertise and support.

Mr. Scully confirmed that median grades were now being recorded on student transcripts, and had been since November 6, 2000.

**2000:132.**

Nominations from the Nominating Committee

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the following nominations be approved:**

**To the Senate Committee on Academic Administration, Rafael Garduno (Medicine/Microbiology & Immunology), January 2001 to June 30, 2002.**

**To the Senate Academic Appeals Committee, Robert Street (Management), November 2000 to June 30, 2003; Stan Cameron (Science/Chemistry), November 2000 to June 30, 2001.**

**To the Senate Committee on the Environment, Stephen Fry (Science/Biology), November 2000 to June 30, 2001; Julia Frid (Spanish, non-faculty member), November 2000 to June 30, 2001.**

**To the Senate Physical Planning Committee, Pauline Gardiner-Barber (Arts & Social Sciences/Sociology & Social Anthropology), January 2001 to June 30, 2001;**

**To the Senate Library Committee, Keith Evans (Law), November 2000 to June 30, 2002.**

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Scully reported that at its 15 November, 2000, meeting, the Senate Committee on Academic Administration had agreed to refer the question of its size, composition and structure to its Agenda

Committee. He drew members' attention to the 16 individuals who represented the Faculties on SCAA, as listed in the 13 November, 2000, memorandum concerning nominations to the Senate Standing Committees. When students, Deans and other administrators were added, the Committee became extraordinarily large and unwieldy, a matter which he understood had been discussed in the past. Any proposed changes to SCAA's composition would be brought to Senate, and would not take effect before July 2001.

**2000:133.**

Question Period

Ms. MacAulay asked that those individuals working on problems related to scholarship notification also investigate the in-course scholarship assessment process. Changes since the implementation of Banner had resulted in some students no longer being eligible for scholarships for which they had been eligible in previous years. Mr. Traves responded that the Registrar was in the process of reviewing the policies for administration of the scholarship program. Some students were not happy with the term-based GPA's under the Banner system, and reports were being generated to establish how many students might have been negatively affected by the change in policy for calculating GPA's. The President anticipated recommendations on this matter.

Returning to the late calculation of eligibility for scholarships, Mr. Bradfield noted that his experience as Undergraduate Advisor in Economics suggested that most of those eligible for and likely to become eligible for scholarships did not take summer school. If calculation of their eligibility was being delayed by the few students taking classes in the summer, perhaps we could create a more efficient system. Mr. Traves pointed out that scholarships were awarded on a comparative assessment of students' performance. GPA's for those taking summer classes were necessary before all students could be ranked. A change in policy might allow summer school grades to be carried forward for calculation at the end of the fall term. That would be a matter for the Registrar and SCAA. Mr. Bradfield thought that in the interests of ensuring that the best students remained at Dalhousie, the appropriate calculations could generate a double-tiered system of ranking which would allow a portion of the scholarships to be safely awarded based on winter term grades. Mr. Traves agreed to pass that suggestion on to the Registrar.

Mr. Scully thought the solution might lie in a temporal restructuring of the academic year. For the purpose of calculating in-course scholarships, we might consider designating May to April as the academic year.

**2000:134.**

Canada Research Chairs and Strategic Research Plan

Mr. Scully wished to make some opening comments before he and Mr. Breckenridge, Vice-President Research, responded to questions about the Canada Research Chairs and Strategic Research Plan. The program was not free from imperfections, but it offered significant opportunities and benefits for Dalhousie. Among these was the fairly long-term boost to faculty complement, with the addition of junior positions funded for two periods of five years and senior positions funded for at least fourteen years. The program's structure presented challenges. At its heart was the requirement that the University identify areas or clusters of research strength. Part of the problem lay in attempting to anticipate how Dalhousie's nominations would be received by

reviewers when placed beside our Strategic Plan. Another factor determining Dalhousie's success under this program was the allocation of Chairs according to our ability to secure funding from the three granting Councils, NSERC, MRC and SSHRC. Our relative weakness in the area of SSHRC grants posed a particular challenge to Dalhousie, leaving us with very few Chairs in the humanities and social sciences, and the difficulty of determining how to best use those Chairs.

Mr. Scully reinforced Ms. Binkley's point from the previous Senate meeting: this was the Strategic Research Plan for this program, and not a general University strategic research plan. In contrast, the C.F.I. Plan was closer to a compendium of research activities at Dalhousie. The limited resource of 43 Chairs would not enable us to address all of the areas of strength at Dalhousie. From the earliest discussions of areas of strength with Deans in Spring 2000, we had recognized this. We had also appreciated the need to create a response which reflected the values and culture at this University. Given the silo nature of Dalhousie, we had emphasized interdisciplinary, creating opportunities for research areas and strengths within and across Faculties.

Mr. Scully also spoke to Mr. Bradfield's comments at the previous meeting concerning process. Mr. Bradfield had identified some of the weaknesses in the process; Mr. Scully wished to begin by identifying the strengths of the process. During the Spring and Summer of 2000, the Deans had made enormous progress in attempting to set aside their Faculty allegiances, identify what was best for Dalhousie, and focus on the importance of interdisciplinarity. Finally, Mr. Scully emphasized that we could expect to see increasing interest by the federal government in supporting university research. Dalhousie needed to recognize that various initiatives, such as the Atlantic Investment Fund, could complement each other and work for the benefit of the whole University.

Ms. Binkley was pleased to hear Mr Scully expand on his understanding of this Strategic Plan. The motion from SAPBC considered at the Senate meeting of October 30, 2000, had referred to "the Strategic Research Plan" without specifying that this was the Strategic Research Plan for the Canada Research Chairs. While Ms. Binkley agreed with Mr. Scully that the Strategic Plan for the Canada Research Chairs should be based on funding from NSERC, MRC and SSHRC, if that Strategic Plan became the Plan for the whole University, it would exclude many important areas of research, such as those recognized in the Canada Foundation for Innovation statement. She desired a more inclusive document which acknowledged the work of many individuals and groups at Dalhousie and much of the work in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences funded by small grants from bodies other than NSERC, MRC and SSHRC. An argument could still be made that work in the Social Sciences and Humanities was not adequately reflected in the allocation of Chairs; but perhaps she and her colleagues had not been aggressive enough in pursuing SSHRC funding. We could address that issue on another occasion.

Ms. Raining-Bird thought that the first part of this document clearly indicated that the Strategic Plan was restricted to the Canada Research Chairs, though she agreed that a larger document was necessary to capture a broad University research plan. Concerning this specific plan, she recalled that early in our discussions the President had made the commitment that the appointments to Canada Research Chairs would be tenure or tenure-track. Mr. Scully confirmed that most of the appointments would be tenure or tenure-track. Ms. Raining-Bird also questioned Mr. Scully's comments concerning the weakness in the area of SSHRC funding. She wished to see comparative statistics, given that in the recent *Maclean's* ranking of universities, the ratings for SSHRC funding were higher for Dalhousie, relative to the other comparable institutions, than for other types of

funding. Thirdly, Ms. Raining-Bird hoped that as we elaborated on the section of the Plan devoted to oil and gas we would include the important area of alternative sources of energy. At a time when the Earth was threatened by emissions resulting largely from oil and gas usages, the failure to include alternative sources of energy was a major problem. Could the Vice-President also elaborate on the tier one and tier two parts of the allocations table?

Mr. Scully explained that Dalhousie had been informed about the preliminary allocations, and the division into tiers, in the Spring of 2000. To some extent, and over the life of the program, we would be able to adjust the tier allocations. Concerning our relative strength in the funding area, in the area of Science, Dalhousie was slightly ahead of where we might have expected to be given the number of faculty and other measures; MRC funding was slightly below where we might have expected to be placed; and the SSHRC funding was roughly half the level that we could have expected had we been performing at the average level. The result was that where we might have received as many as ten Chairs, we had received five. Mr. Traves explained that though we have received 2.4% of the Chairs, based on a total of 2.4% of funding from the three agencies, we had received 2.9% of NSERC funding, 2.2% of MRC funding, but only 1.3% of SSHRC funding.

Ms. Binkley clarified that the *Maclean's* ranking was based on the success rate for the number of applications submitted to the granting agencies. While our success rate for SSHRC grants was high, we were not submitting enough applications. Ms. Binkley reminded members that SSHRC funding was available for everything from Management, to Library Science, Law, parts of Health Professions, the Humanities and Social Sciences, and Economics. It was not restricted to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

Ms. MacDonald clarified that Chairs that might be within the clinical departments within the Faculty of Medicine might not be eligible for tenure or tenure-track positions, but were part of the CAPR classification, the clinical equivalent of tenure and tenure-track appointments. Any stipulation that all appointments to Chairs be tenure or tenure-track would have excluded many eligible individuals.

Mr. Pacey had concerns about the way in which the Canada Research Chairs program was being implemented at Dalhousie. He had been told that this program had been put in place at the request of the President of the University of Toronto and several other large institutions in the country. His understanding was that in part the objective had been to establish what we might call a two-tier system of universities within Canada. Within Canada we had always drawn a distinction between institutions on the basis of quality and stature. But he believed this program would give the University of Toronto approximately 250 Chairs, many more than they might have expected had allocations been based on student enrolment. That was one concern, but this was a government program, and we had to do the best we could within the parameters set by the government and the program. His second concern revolved around the question of whether we should emphasize keeping our own best people or attracting those from elsewhere. At Dalhousie we were in a relatively weak position when it came to attempting to attract individuals from elsewhere. We had a very strong reputation, but we lacked the money which institutions such as the University of Toronto, and other universities able to draw on provincial research funds, could offer. Top research stars at Dalhousie with outstanding records for attracting funding were already being attracted to Chairs at other universities.

Mr. Pacey noted that in some instances faculty members had assumed heavier than normal teaching

loads in order to provide colleagues who were research stars with a better opportunity to shine, and in the process develop the University's reputation. He would like to think that the Strategic Research Plan created by Dalhousie would also contribute to keeping our most talented researchers. But he was concerned that the emphasis in the current document on specific areas and themes did not provide enough room for all our stars. Ideally, and if we were creating a university from scratch, we could identify special areas and try to recruit exceptional individuals from outside Dalhousie. But in searching externally for talent which may or may not exist, and which may or may not be willing to come to Dalhousie, we ran the serious risk of losing gifted senior members and promising junior colleagues. Could we not do more to protect our very best people? Could we not simply commit ourselves to attracting the very best people, irrespective of their field? We could conduct an internal competition to identify our strongest internal candidates for CRC's, and put them forward to the federal government. In addition, it was important to make our best people feel appreciated here.

Mr. Traves assured Mr. Pacey that the issues he raised had been considered. Perhaps he could allay some concerns by putting the CRC's in an additional context. Over the next decade we could expect to see a turnover in faculty positions at Canadian universities amounting to between 20,000 to 30,000 faculty positions. Consequently, we needed to remember that we could not hope or plan to deal with problems of retention and recruitment entirely in the context of this relatively small program. We were moving into a much more competitive sellers' market rather than the buyers' market which had prevailed in Canadian universities over the past twenty years. Mr. Traves shared Mr. Pacey's concern to retain our most highly funded colleagues, though it was important to remember that sometimes those not highly funded were highly regarded from other perspectives. But we needed to accept that some of our best people would be attracted to other universities. This reflected not the CRC program but the sea change in the academic labour market. The CRC's were only one way in which we could respond to that change. Over time we would need to work out further strategies and more flexible arrangements. At present we were constrained by the ways we could respond and the number of responses we could give to competitive offers. Recently, a modest change in the Collective Agreement had created slightly more flexibility, but in a rapidly evolving labour market we would need even greater flexibility.

Dalhousie would also have to consider not just the question of financial rewards but the importance of making our people feel appreciated. This University had been comparatively slow to introduce internal distinctions. Other universities had programs for research professors and university professors and a variety of internal academic distinctions which he thought we should consider.

Concerning the structure of this specific program, Mr. Traves pointed out that in the area of research we already had a multi-tiered system of Canadian universities. We should not confuse excellence based on one particular set of criteria with the excellence of an institution's teaching and academic programs. Many universities with modest research output had excellent undergraduate programs. But in Nova Scotia, in the area of research, we had a two-tiered university system, with Dalhousie accounting for almost all of the funded research within the province's universities. That did not mean Dalhousie's arts, science or commerce programs were necessarily better than those at other Nova Scotian universities. With regard to major research universities outside the province, the University of Toronto, for example, had approximately five times the student body (FTE) that Dalhousie had, and they had received approximately five times the number of Canada Research Chairs. Our problem was size not lack of competitiveness.

Mr. Traves thought the Strategic Research Plan itself was fairly broad-based. It also provided the focus required by the program. Had we chosen to simply put forward our 43 best professors, without a clear Strategic Research Plan, we could have expected to meet with very little success. With some creativity, we could fit a large number of current Dalhousie faculty members into the many categories. The process had benefitted from considerable input by the Deans, and gradually we had been able to create a plan that we could all accept. But the process and the plan reflected the variety of challenges we faced. We had lost a large number of faculty members over the last decade, and we had attempted to bring that to the attention of the appropriate bodies and individuals outside the University. Also, in the last round of negotiations with the faculty union, the loss of faculty had been a central concern, and on many occasions since he had been encouraged to hear individuals speaking about the need to build up complement. When we had an opportunity to make a significant number of appointments, such as this program gave us, rather than reappointing our own faculty, he thought our preference was toward building up faculty complement. In some crucial areas we were committed to appointing our own members, and in some instances the appointment of an internal candidate would help to generate funding for additional appointments. Some were colleagues who were already funded externally, and our hope was to maintain that external funding and build greater strength in that area. In general, however, Mr. Traves believed that our bias should be towards faculty renewal and towards attracting scholars who could rebuild our programs and carry us into the next two or three decades.

Mr. Scully drew attention to the significant omission in the current draft of the Plan -- a program in the Humanities, as indicated on p. 13. In response to Ms. Raining-Bird, Mr. Scully observed that the drafters of the Strategic Research Plan had overlooked the question of alternative sources of energy. It would not be a significant shift to rename the section on oil and gas studies "energy studies". Thirdly, the University was alert to the problem of retention of faculty. We needed to be ready to propose counter offers to colleagues being wooed by other institutions. Sometimes we would not be able to offer enough, and some individuals would be influenced to relocate by a new professional opportunity or for domestic reasons. But Mr. Scully was encouraging the Deans to keep him informed concerning the potential loss of members, in particular anyone working in one of Dalhousie's areas of strength. Mr. Scully reminded members that this was a living document. Future amendments might identify additional areas to which we wished to commit resources.

Mr. Pacey noted that Mr. Traves had outlined a process of making external appointments and in the process freeing up money to increase the complement. If we could appoint a current Dalhousie faculty member to a Canada Research Chair, then we would also have freed up salary money to pay someone from outside. Mr. Pacey also encouraged the University to take a proactive stance and preempt outside offers by indicating to individuals, now, that we appreciated them and that we were going to put them forward for a Chair, not wait to see whether they were recruited by another university.

Ms. Raining-Bird elaborated on the idea that if someone within Dalhousie received a Chair their position was opened up for the hiring of another faculty member. On the matter of external appointments, Ms. Raining-Bird had heard that a number of major institutions would be recruiting Chairs exclusively from external candidates. If we focused on external recruitment, we would be scrambling for the same researchers, to the extent that our Strategic Research Plan overlapped with those of other universities. Did Mr. Scully think we might have difficulty finding excellent candidates to fill our positions if we were too externally focused?



Mr. Scully responded that the key difference between this and other recruitment programs at Dalhousie was that we expected to receive confirmation that the tier one and tier two structure enforced by HRDC for faculty recruitment would be set aside for this program, enabling us to recruit anywhere in the world. The focus on clusters in the Strategic Research Plan would also increase our ability to attract candidates, by creating the type of intellectual community and research depth which excited active researchers. Other initiatives, such as the Atlantic Genome Program, would provide similar opportunities to build depth.

Mr. El-Hawary encouraged Dalhousie to pursue the types of endowed and distinguished chairs which could satisfy the ego of colleagues, while demonstrating our appreciation and respect. Concerning the stars to whom some had referred, did we have a list of these individuals, and was it greater or smaller than 43? He would be interested to see the performance indicators or criteria by which stars were identified. On the question of long-term planning, Mr. El-Hawary reminded members that a good long-term plan depended on good short-term and mid-term plans. Did we have those? On the question of expanding the area of oil and gas studies to energy studies, one part of Mr. El-Hawary was delighted by the prospect, since his own area of expertise was electrical energy systems, but another part of him was concerned that broadening the scope might dilute the initial focus.

Mr. Scully appreciated the caution concerning energy studies, but would need time to think over and discuss with others the suggestion made today. He did not know whether the Strategic Research Plan could be categorized as a long-range plan, given the speed with which it had been put in place. But it would be tested and improved as we proceeded. During its third year, the program would be evaluated nationally, at which point aspects of the program might be modified. We would also need to monitor carefully the possible difficulties in recruiting suitable individuals, to which Ms. Raining-Bird had referred. As for a listing of stars, the Deans had forwarded a list of approximately 20 or 30 individuals, the largest number of whom had come from Science.

Mr. Scully proposed that the motion concerning the Strategic Research Plan for the Canada Research Chairs passed at the 30 October, 2000, meeting of Senate be clarified

**by the insertion of the words "for Canada Research Chairs" after "Plan".**

The motion, as amended, would then read:

**That the Strategic Research Plan for Canada Research Chairs be endorsed as a working document subject to annual amendments beginning in the Spring of 2001.**

There was no dissent to this clarification.

Ms. Binkley wished to emphasize that when we spoke about stars at Dalhousie we recognized the importance of teaching and considered it a major component of this institution. It was the balance of teaching and research which made us great. We needed to appreciate our fine teachers and our good solid researchers and teachers who worked every day teaching the majority of our students. Research was only one part of Dalhousie. Mr. Stuttard noted that the latest issue of the CAUT Bulletin contained a number of articles on that issue.

**2000:135.**

Proposed MLIS/MBA Combined Program

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the proposed combined Master of Library and Information Studies and Master of Business Administration be approved.**

Ms. McIntyre considered the combined program an excellent initiative. Mr. MacDonald assured her that the MLIS component of the program would still receive accreditation from the American Library Association. Mr. MacDonald pointed out that this type of program was being encouraged across North America.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**2000:136.**

President's Report

Mr. Traves reminded Senators that as of 23 November, 2000, Dalhousie would come under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPOP) passed by the province of Nova Scotia in the Spring of 2000. Under the terms of the Act, previously confidential documents could be solicited. He asked members to please keep in mind that the Act covered everyone in the University. Everyone's salary would be open, along with many other documents within the University. The University legal counsel, Mr. Crocker, had been appointed the FOIPOP Coordinator, responsible for coordinating the University's responses to questions; and FOIPOP representatives had been appointed for all academic and administrative units. To provide for release of information in a timely fashion the University's record system would need to be better organized. Fortunately, the recently appointed University Archivist had experience helping the University of Manitoba respond to similar legislation in Manitoba. The Act would change the way we conducted some of our business at Dalhousie. The President thought Mr. Crocker would be happy to provide an information session on FOIPOP to Senators.

Speaking to enrolments for the academic year 2000-2001, Mr. Traves noted that we had attracted approximately the same number of students as in the previous year, but our full-time enrolment equivalent was down. Some trends in our undergraduate programs were worrying. We were studying the sources of these declines, and would be undertaking much more work in this area. To be more competitive and to secure the number of students we hoped to attract, we would need to increase our recruitment initiatives. To this end, he had authorized the Office of the Registrar, with an appropriate increase in funding, to expand some of their recruitment activities across the country. Similarly, to improve the University's data assessment capacity, he had authorized additional funds to enable the Office of Institutional Affairs, under Mr. Christie, to undertake the necessary analysis of trends. This was money well spent because for every student lost we lost tuition revenue and potentially the government grant tied to enrolment.

Finally, Mr. Traves drew members' attention to that section of the *Maclean's* most recent ranking of Universities which related to our students. We had reason to be encouraged by and proud of the quality of our students. The President noted in particular the very high average entering grade of

new students; the high proportion of the student body with average entering grades above 75%; the excellent completion rate for our students; the number of student awards per 1000 students; and the high number of students from outside the province.

Mr. El-Hawary had noticed that the minutes of Senate were very detailed in comparison with those for the Board of Governors, which were less than detailed, and the proceedings of his Department, which were condensed. Would the University Counsel provide guidance concerning the appropriate level of detail in minutes, under FOIPOP? Mr. Traves thought that all the minutes to which Mr. El-Hawary had referred were already public documents. Senate and Board minutes, and perhaps those of some Faculties, were also available on the Web. He believed the contents of minutes was an issue best decided by the bodies concerned.

Ms. Raining-Bird considered the decrease in enrolment at Dalhousie cause for some concern, given that enrolments were rising in universities across the country and that the country appeared to be on the threshold of significant increases in enrolment. She also found striking in the recent *Maclean's* ranking the difference in tuition rates between other Canadian universities and those in the Atlantic provinces, and in particular the tuition levels at Dalhousie, relative to those at comparable universities. Did we have the ability to identify any link between the level of tuition and enrolment? Could we address that in the future?

Mr. Traves responded that while enrolments were up across the country, in Atlantic Canada they were flat or marginally down. Virtually all of the anticipated increase in the total population of students attending universities would originate in Ontario and westward. We would need to try to attract those students to Dalhousie. Though the demographics for Nova Scotia were flat, we already had a strong base in the other areas of the country and the President was confident we would be able to continue to attract high-quality students. On tuition, we were concerned about the impact of tuition on students. At the same time, we needed tuition fees that partly offset the comparatively low levels of provincial funding, and we needed to maintain quality. For students from outside Halifax, tuition was only one component of the total costs of attending Dalhousie, which was between \$12,000 and \$15,000.

Mr. Stuttard asked whether Mr. Crocker was securing any relief from his duties, given his increased responsibilities related to FOIPOP. Mr. Traves responded that the University had hired a lawyer with a background in commercial law to pick up some of Mr. Crocker's responsibilities. Concerns had been expressed that the legal office was unable to respond as quickly as desirable to the variety of issues for which it was responsible.

#### **2000:137.**

##### Senate Orientation

Mr. Stuttard reported that the Steering Committee was considering some type of Senate orientation during one of the regular meeting times, probably during the second meeting in January. He would appreciate any input concerning the format members desired. He had also received requests for some discussion of *Roberts Rules of Order*.

#### **2000:138.**

##### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.