

Item: Senate Minutes, October 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 October 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, October 16, 2000, at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Ben-Abdallah, Binkley, Bleasdale, Blunden, Bradfield, Brett, Caldwell, Caley, Clairmont, Coffin, Connolly, Coté, Cox, Devlin, El-Hawary, Emodi, Farrell, Fraser, Giacomantonio, Girard, Harvey, Jalilvand, Kay-Raining Bird, Kemp, Kimmins, Lee, Maes, N. MacDonald, R. MacDonald, MacInnis, MacLean, McGrath, McIntyre, Neves, Pacey, Phillips, Poel, Roberts, Rowe, Russell, Rutherford, Savoy, Slonim, Tindall, Traves, Treves, Ugursal, Wainwright, Watters, Whyte.

Regrets: Cunningham, Guppy, Ipson, Johnston, Lohmann, MacAulay, Murphy, Sastri, Scully, Starnes.

**2000:099.**

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard drew members' attention to the on-going problems with the sound system for University Hall, and reported that the President's Office would be hiring an expert to evaluate the system and suggest a solution.

Mr. Stuttard noted that there would be three items under matters arising. The agenda was then **ADOPTED** as amended.

**2000:100.**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Mr. Devon Roberts and Ms. Watters were added to the list of those in attendance, and the minutes of the meeting of October 16, 2000, were **ADOPTED** as amended.

**2000:101.**

Name of the former TUNS Campus

Mr. Stuttard reminded members that at its meeting of September 25, 2000, the Senate had agreed that the former TUNS campus be identified as the DalTech Campus of Dalhousie University. At its meeting of September 26, 2000, the Board of Governors had not agreed with this recommendation, and had voted to change the name to the Sexton Campus. Mr. Traves added

that the Board had engaged in an extended discussion of the matter. At the suggestion of the Board, Mr. Traves and Board member and current President of the Alumni Association, Ms. Lucy Kanary, had attended a recent meeting of the Faculty of Engineering to explain the reasons behind the Board's decision – primarily the question of creating a strong image for the University under the one name Dalhousie. Mr. Traves believed that despite some differences expressed at that meeting, members of the Faculty of Engineering were satisfied that the issue had been settled. The Dean of Architecture had also expressed his opinion that the name Sexton Campus would not be a problem for that Faculty. The President would be providing the external community with the rationale behind the adoption of the name Sexton Campus.

**2000:102.**

Sub-Committee of the Senate Library Committee

Mr. Stuttard reported that the Chair of the Senate Library Committee, Frank Smith, had informed him that the sub-committee reviewing the new arrangements for the Science Library had interviewed the University Librarian and the Dean of Science. Mr. Smith expected to submit a report from the subcommittee to the full Senate Library Committee in the near future. That report would then be forwarded to Senate.

**2000:103.**

Report of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College for 1999/2000

Mr. Stuttard reported that Senate Office had received the Nova Scotia Agricultural College Annual Report for 1999/2000. Members were invited to consult that Report in Senate Office or request a copy from that Office.

**2000:104.**

Question Period

Ms. Binkley noted the proliferation of printed materials which purported to be Dalhousie-based but lacked either the University colours, black and gold, or what she fondly called the dead eagle logo, or both. Some of this material was being produced by Public Relations, the Alumni Affairs Committee, or the Development Office. She wished to know the University's current policy concerning our colours and logo. Mr. Traves shared Ms. Binkley's concern over the diversity in the use of images for Dalhousie throughout the University. To some extent this was understandable in an institution as diverse as Dalhousie. Approximately one year ago Mr. Traves had asked Public Relations to produce a paper addressing the University's legal image, and he believed that office would shortly be bringing forward a document for discussion. This was important to the creation of a strong presence for Dalhousie within the larger community. Mr. Kimmins noted that the former President of Dalhousie had addressed this issue approximately twelve years ago, and the Board had agreed that only one symbol would be used on University letterhead. He cited examples of the confusing array of images and colours currently appearing on University materials. Mr. El-Hawary asked whether black and gold would now be required for materials produced by members and units of the former DalTech. Mr. Traves suggested that members not immediately throw out stationary on which they might

already have expended considerable sums. Mr. Bradfield was more concerned about the use of the Dalhousie logo by private organizations with whom we had a lapsed contract, no contract, or only the possibility of a contract.

On another matter, Mr. Bradfield asked whether more solid enrolment numbers were now available. Mr. Traves referred to data which compared the Faculties across both undergraduate and graduate programs as of October 15, 2000. Using the total undergraduate and graduate enrolment, and looking at the number of students as opposed to number of classes in which they were enrolled, Dalhousie had forty students less than last year, on a base of 12,700 students. With the inclusion of King's students, we had 38 students less than last year, on a base of 13,580. There was significant variation and cause for some concern within that framework. Vice-Presidents Scully and McKee, and others involved in the Enrolment Management process would be looking at these variations. For example, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences was down 128 students at the undergraduate level; Engineering was down; Computer Science was up significantly; Management was down at the undergraduate but up at the graduate level. Mr. Traves considered most worrying the drop in first year enrolments, since this would carry over into enrolments for the next few years, unless we saw a substantial increase in transfer students in the year 2001/2002. Enrolment patterns would have a significant impact on the total budget for the University and on the enrolment-based budgets of some Faculties in particular.

Mr. Traves pointed to the need to address a range of questions concerning the University's image, and the recruitment of students and their treatment once enrolled. Noteworthy was the problem of residence space, given the recruitment of approximately 40% of our students from outside the city, province, and country. This was a particular concern for first-year students and their families, and at present we were examining methods for increasing the availability of residence space, addressing financial issues, campus planning issues, and a number of organizational questions. The President hoped to see substantial residence construction on campus over the next two or three years; he would provide further information concerning this matter as substantive issues emerged.

#### **2000:105.**

##### Nominations to the University Tenure and Promotions Panel

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

**That the following nominations to the University Tenure and Promotions Panel be approved: Christina Luckyj, Arts & Social Sciences/English, October 2000–June 30, 2001; George Turnbull, Health Professions/Physiotherapy, October 2000–June 30, 2003; Gail Anderson, Medicine/Surgery/Pharmacology/Biomedical Engineering, October 2000–June 30, 2002; David Hoskin, Medicine/Microbiology & Immunology, October 2000–June 30, 2003; Jugen Kreuzer, Science/Physics, January 2001–June 30, 2001.**

These individuals had received the requisite approval of the President and of the Dalhousie Faculty Association.

The motion was **CARRIED** without dissent.

**2000:106.**

Nominations to Senate Nominating Committee

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

**That the following individuals be appointed to serve on the Senate Nominating Committee: Carolyn Watters, Computer Science, September 2000–August 31, 2003; Joe Murphy, Dentistry/Dental Clinical Sciences, September 2000–August 31, 2003; Mary-Lou Ellerton, Health Professions/Nursing, September 2000–August 31, 2003; Hugh Kindred, Law, January 2001–June 30, 2001 (leave replacement); Stan Cameron, Science/Chemistry, September 2000–August 31, 2003.**

The motion was **CARRIED** without dissent.

**2000:107.**

Amendments to the Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate

Mr. Stuttard drew members' attention to his memorandum of September 29, 2000, circulated with the agenda. On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the amendments to the *Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate*, as indicated in the Chair's memorandum to Senators dated September 29, 2000, be adopted.**

Mr. Stuttard reminded members that a motion to amend the Constitution required that two-thirds of members voting must be in favour in order to adopt the amendment.

The motion was **CARRIED** without dissent.

**2000:108.**

Awarding of Degrees – All Faculties

**College of Arts and Science**

Dean Kimmins, Provost of the College of Arts and Science, recommended the following degrees and diplomas:

Bachelor of Arts .....	114
(Distinction 7; Honours 16; First Class Honours 3; Adv.Major 24)	
Bachelor of Arts Advanced Major Conversion .....	4
Diploma in Costume Studies .....	1
Bachelor of Science .....	65
(Distinction 3; Honours 7; First Class Honours 3; Adv.Major 26)	
Bachelor of Science Advanced Major Conversion .....	6
	<b>TOTAL 190</b>

## Faculty of Architecture

On behalf of the Faculty of Architecture, Dean Emodi recommended the following degrees be awarded:

Bachelor of Environmental Design Studies.....	49
(Distinction 3)	

## Faculty of Computer Science

On behalf of the Faculty of Computer Science, Dean Slonim recommended the following degrees be awarded:

Bachelor of Computer Science .....	8
Bachelor of Science .....	10
	<b>TOTAL 18</b>

## Faculty of Engineering

On behalf of the Faculty of Engineering, Mr. El-Hawary recommended that the following degrees be awarded:

Bachelor of Engineering .....	9
(Biological 1; Civil 2; Electrical/Computer 5; Mechanical 1)	

## Faculty of Health Professions

On behalf of the Faculty of Health Professions, Dean McIntyre recommended that the following degrees be awarded:

Diploma in Health Services Administration.....	2
Bachelor of Physical Education .....	1
Bachelor of Physical Education/Bachelor of Education.....	1
Bachelor of Recreation .....	2
Bachelor of Science (Kinesiology).....	3
Bachelor of Science (Nursing-Post RN).....	3
Bachelor of Social Work.....	8
Bachelor of Science (Occupational Therapy).....	1
Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy .....	1
	<b>TOTAL 22</b>

## Faculty of Law

On behalf of the Faculty of Law, Dean Russell recommended the awarding of the following degree:

Bachelor of Laws .....	1
------------------------	---

## Faculty of Management

On behalf of the Faculty of Management, Dean Jalilvand recommended degrees be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Commerce .....24

## Faculty of Medicine

On behalf of the Faculty of Medicine, Dean MacDonald recommended the awarding of the following degree:

Doctor of Medicine .....1

## Faculty of Graduate Studies

On behalf of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, Acting Dean Rutherford recommended approval of the following degrees:

Doctor of Philosophy .....33  
Master of Laws .....4  
Master of Arts (includes 6 Joint M.A.'s in Women's Studies) .....51  
Master of Architecture (MARFP).....23  
Master of Applied Science (MASC).....11  
Master of Business Administration (MBA).....16  
Master of Business Administration - Financial Services (MBA-FS) .....32  
Master of Computer Science.....11  
Master of Development Economics.....2  
Master of Engineering .....9  
Master of Environmental Studies .....8  
Master of Health Services Administration (MHSA) .....1  
Master of Information Technology Education (MITE) .....16  
Master of Library & Information Studies .....2  
Master of Marine Management.....15  
Master of Nursing .....7  
Master of Public Administration (MPA) .....3  
Graduate Diploma of Public Administration .....1  
Master of Science.....54  
Master of Social Work (MSW).....9  
Master of Urban & Rural Planning (MURP).....6  
**TOTAL 315**

Ms. Binkley moved:

**That the appropriate Dean or the Provost of the College of Arts and Science, and the Registrar, in consultation with the Chair of Senate, be authorized to amend the graduation list to correct any errors or omissions discovered before the relevant Convocations; and that each amendment and its explanation be reported to Senate.**

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**2000:109.**

Senate Review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies

Mr. Stuttard referred members to his email of October 16, 2000, reminding members of the two motions from SAPBC that had not yet been consider by Senate.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the Provincial Government be urged to establish a Provincial program of graduate scholarships in Nova Scotia.**

Mr. Rutherford recalled that as long ago as 1990 similar consideration had been given to urging the province to establish a program of graduate scholarships. The Faculty Council of Graduate Studies had strongly endorsed this motion when Mr. Rutherford had presented it to them in September. Initiatives to explore the possibilities of such a program were already underway. Mr. Traves added that this issue had been strongly advanced last year during the promotion of increased support for provincial Universities. He had been pleased that the Presidents of those Universities with significantly less direct involvement in graduate programs had supported the need for expanded graduate student support. Despite the faint hope that this proposal would be acted upon, given the current financial state of the province, Mr. Traves had been impressed by the fact that government officials appeared now to recognize the importance of this issue and raised it themselves as one of the many items requiring their attention.

Mr. Stuttard would undertake to write to the provincial government on behalf of the Senate should the motion pass. Mr. Ugursal suggested that the Chair of Senate include in any such communication the justification for the motion. Mr. Rutherford assured Senators that he could provide the justification easily.

The motion was **CARRIED** without dissent.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the University explore ways to increase funding for graduate scholarships through means such as raising the 5% ceiling on expenditures from endowment funds.**

Mr. Stuttard pointed out that this motion was a modification of one of the recommendations of the Review Committee.

Ms. McIntyre believed all Senators supported increases to graduate scholarships. Those in Health Professions were delighted to see the Nova Scotia Health Research Foundation launched and engaged in its first competition for graduate and other types of funding. She understood that all eligible graduate students had been funded by the first round of allocations. This was wonderful news, but perhaps also pointed to the deficit of applications in comparison to available funds. Ms. McIntyre had been able to review the promotional material from NSERC, SSHRC, and CIHC and to look at all the graduate scholarships they awarded at the Masters, Doctoral, and Post-Doctoral levels, and she had been struck by the relatively few Dalhousie names. Consequently, she noted the importance of seeking external funding for graduate students, as well as increased internal funding.



Mr. Ugursal asked who would be responsible to report to Senate on this matter. He also wondered why the motion singled out raising the 5% ceiling on the endowment fund expenditures. On numerous previous occasions the Vice-President (Finance & Administration) had argued that the 5% ceiling would be difficult to raise. Would it not be better to end the motion after "graduate scholarships"? Mr. Kimmins asked the Acting Dean of Graduate Studies whether he wished to address the issue of competitiveness in the area of external graduate funding raised by Ms. McIntyre. Mr. Rutherford agreed with Mr. Kimmins that Universities were given a quota of NSERC and SSHRC scholarships based on the NSERC and SSHRC awards to the University, and that Dalhousie's quotas were filled every year. Mr. Rutherford explained the internal process of selection which put forward qualified individuals to meet the quota.

Mr. Traves believed the Board of Governors was not likely to consider changing its policy on endowment funds, for the reasons the Vice-President (Finance & Administration) had explained many times. Mr. Traves also recalled that Mr. Bradfield had suggested a minimum of three other areas which could benefit from the revenue generated by increasing the ceiling on endowment fund expenditures. Mr. Bradfield did not know whether the issue had ever been taken back to the Board, but the policy came from the Board's 1990 Financial Strategy Report. Given that the Board had violated or changed a number of the principles adopted in that Report, for example those related to funding and buying buildings, perhaps they would also reconsider this principle. The 5% ceiling had been directed at protecting the capital value of the endowment, and that had grown well over their original target. Mr. Bradfield explained that he had proposed this clause in SAPBC because he believed that if we were going to ask the provincial government to take action we also needed to consider those actions which we could take.

Mr. Slonim requested clarification as to whether we needed to meet quotas for NSERC scholarships or whether we could put forward as many students as we wished. Was internal censorship or screening of applicants limiting our success in securing NSERC funding? Mr. Rutherford responded that NSERC dictated the vetting to which Mr. Slonim referred, and would not be pleased should Dalhousie decide to send forward as many candidates as we wanted. The internal screening followed the guidelines established by NSERC. Mr. Ugursal recalled that at TUNS they had submitted a greater number of applications to NSERC and had received more scholarships. Since amalgamation, the Faculty of Graduate Studies had removed students from the Faculty of Engineering's list. The criteria used by the Faculty had not changed.

Returning to the question of raising the 5% ceiling on expenditures from the endowment fund, Mr. Ugursal moved an amendment:

**That a full stop be placed after the word "scholarships" and that all the remaining words be deleted.**

Mr. Kimmins thought that deletion of the reference to raising the 5% ceiling on expenditures from the endowment fund would make the motion less controversial, and consequently strengthen it. Mr. Farrell asked whether the amendment was a substantive change in the motion. Mr. Stuttard responded that it was not. Mr. Bradfield did not believe Senators should censor themselves by not raising issues which they thought the Board would oppose. He believed the Board needed much more information concerning the academic activities and the feelings of the academics within the University. He also spoke to the difficulty of getting money moved from one category in the budget to another. He reminded members that recently he had asked about

the \$3.5 mil in pension surplus which did not appear in the budget, and he had been told that money could be discussed once it was clear it existed. However, Senate had not been consulted and the money had already been spent.

The amendment to the motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Wainwright was concerned that the amendment left the motion with no direction. He asked those who had supported the amendment to suggest alternative means of focussing the motion. Mr. Ugursal asked again who would be charged with implementing this motion. The Chair clarified that the reference to "the University" should be interpreted as it was normally interpreted in such motions. Ms. Treves suggested that all Senators might be able to support a better-worded motion which still included reference to raising the 5% ceiling on the expenditures from the endowment funds.

Mr. Traves shared Mr. Wainwright's frustration with the vagueness of the motion, though he thought their perspectives were different. In such discussions at Senate, Mr. Traves never heard what members would like to see cut, but heard only a deafening silence. Where did increased graduate funding rank in relation to the fifty other priorities raised in these meetings? Making a budget statement was unhelpful unless we addressed all aspects of the budget.

Speaking to the need to clarify our priorities, Mr. Rutherford moved:

**That "in conjunction with the Acting Dean of Graduate Studies explore as an urgent matter all ways for increasing graduate scholarships" be inserted following "University".**

Mr. Rutherford reminded members that the urgency was based on the fact that we were becoming non-competitive in some fields. This would clarify our direction and put some onus on the responsible Faculty as well as the University.

Mr. Brett suggested an amendment to the amendment:

**That the words "acting through the Budget Advisory Committee" be inserted before "in conjunction with the Acting Dean of Graduate Studies."**

Ms. McDonald saw the amendment to the amendment as allowing for consideration of the graduate funding within the context of other Faculties' efforts to increase their scholarships and bursaries.

The amendment to the amendment was **CARRIED**, and the amended amendment was **CARRIED**.

Ms. Raining-Bird thought Senate's position could be expressed more effectively by indicating in the motion that graduate funding should be given increased priority. Mr. Jalilvand requested further information as to why our students were unable to secure more scholarships. Where did the problem lie? What was the experience of other universities in this regard? Mr. Slonim shared Mr. Jalilvand's questions and concerns. Mr. Rutherford noted that the motion referred to increasing the internal funding available to our students, and at Dalhousie the majority of the scholarship funding was provided by the Killam endowment. Ms. McIntyre agreed that internal funding was important; however, she believed Dalhousie was not as competitive as it might be in

the area of external funding for research and graduate studies. The Vice-President Research would hopefully make an important contribution in this area.

Mr. Stuttard reminded members that the background to this motion was within the Report of the Review Committee which had been distributed to all Senators.

Concerning the admonitions to take into consideration all of the details of the big picture, Mr. Wainwright noted that senators had not instructed the Nova Scotia government concerning what to cut and not cut in the motion calling for a provincial graduate scholarship program. If Senate did not pass this motion, it would be objecting to something so crucial to the University that he would wonder why we were here. Mr. Traves thought SAPBC should have provided greater clarity and considered a range of issues rather than one hobby horse. The motion spoke to a range of issues. In future SAPBC should look at the larger financial picture when passing such motions.

Members then voted on the main motion as amended:

**That the University acting through the Budget Advisory Committee and in conjunction with the Acting Dean of Graduate Studies explore as an urgent matter all ways for increasing graduate scholarships.**

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Caley asked to speak to the motion which had been tabled at the last meeting concerning the delegation of admissions decisions to programs. The Chair reminded Mr. Caley that in a formal session of Senate members spoke to motions. Did he intend to move that the motion be lifted from the table? Members agreed to allow Mr. Caley to speak without a motion.

Mr. Caley thought that much of the concern at the last meeting had been about the lack of specifics concerning a mechanism for auditing and monitoring admissions, rather than about the delegation of admissions decisions. He wished to leave the motion on the table until he could bring forward a document which addressed the auditing mechanism. Such a document might also address the issues raised in the Chair's email of October 16, 2000.

Members agreed to allow Mr. Rutherford and Ms. Bleasdale to comment.

Mr. Rutherford was uncomfortable with Mr. Caley addressing a substantive issue concerning a motion that had been tabled and could not be debated. In addition, a proposed plan of action concerning the motion was being proposed, and the auditing mechanism intrinsic in that motion was substantially different from that which the Report of the Senate Review Committee had proposed. Ms. Bleasdale was concerned that this matter had already generated considerable controversy, anxiety, and uncertainty. That was not an atmosphere conducive to moving forward. She would have preferred that those who had advanced the now tabled motion had taken the past two weeks to address the issues already raised by senators. The issues raised in the Chair's email were not a surprise. They had all been discussed over the past four weeks by senators through email exchanges and during Senate meetings.

Mr. Slonim suggested that we move on to other agenda items. Mr. Wainwright was concerned about the way in which this matter had been handled. The Report of the Review Committee for the Faculty of Graduate Studies was legitimately before this body. The Chair asked whether any

senator wished to move a motion which could then be discussed. Mr. Traves noted the desirability of addressing other issues on the agenda.

Mr. Wainwright asked Mr. Caley when he planned to bring forward his document on the second part of the tabled motion. Mr. Caley responded that he would bring it forward in one month. Mr. Wainwright would move to take the motion from the table at the next meeting of Senate, October 30, 2000. Mr. Rutherford argued that the proposal to bring forward a plan which would effectively circumvent that part of the motion which addressed implementation of the motion was inappropriate.

Ms. Binkley moved:

**That item 11 become an order-of-the-day for 5:50 p.m.**

The motion was **CARRIED** without dissent.

**2000:110.**

Proposed Modifications to the Bachelor of Commerce (Co-op)

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the proposed modifications to the B. Commerce (Co-op. Ed.) degree program be adopted with the understanding that simultaneously the B. Commerce (Honours) program be discontinued.**

The motion was **CARRIED** without dissent.

**2000:111.**

Proposed B.Sc. with Minor in Computer Science

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the proposal for a modified B.Sc. with minor in Computer Science be adopted.**

The motion was **CARRIED** without dissent.

Members agreed to postpone discussion of item 7 until the next meeting of Senate, October 30, 2000.

**2000:112.**

Annual Report of the Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee for 1999/2000

Ms. McIntyre moved:

**That Senate extend a vote of thanks to SCITPC for its excellent work.**

The motion was **CARRIED**.

The Chair noted that he had sent to the current Chair of SCITPC, Mr. Sedgwick, a memorandum

concerning some aspects of the Report which were problematic from the point of view of the Senate Office. Members agreed to defer until the next meeting of Senate, by which point they would have received a copy of Mr. Stuttard's memo.

**2000:113.**

President's Report

Mr. Traves asked members of Senate to please attend the two Convocation ceremonies on October 21, 2000. These Convocations provided an opportunity for faculty members to demonstrate their support for the graduates and their families and to share in their pleasure.

**2000.114.**

Rescinding of Degrees

*In camera*

On returning to open session, the Chair reported that the degree previously awarded to David Lane, Master of Urban & Rural Planning, had been rescinded. Ten members had abstained from voting on this item.

The Chair also reported that the degree of Bachelor of Computer Science was prematurely conferred on Senan Al-Mosawie at the May 2000 Convocation and had been rescinded. Mr. Al-Mosawie would receive his Bachelor of Computer Science (cooperative program) at the October 2000 Convocation.

**2000:115.**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**

***APPROVED* MINUTES**

**OF**

**SENATE MEETING**

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, October 30, 2000, at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, MacDonald Building.

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

Binkley, Bleasdale, Blunden, Bradfield, Brett, Caley, Cochrane, Coffin, Cunningham, Devlin, Downe-Wamboldt, El-Hawary, Emodi, Farrell, Fraser, Giacomantonio, Girard, Guppy, Ipson, Jalilvand, Johnston, Lee, Lohmann, B. MacDonald, MacInnis, MacLean, Maes, McGrath, McIntyre, Murphy, Neves, Pacey, Poel, Roberts, Rowe, Russell, Rutherford, Sastri, Savoy, Scully, Starnes, Tindall, Traves, Ugursal, Wainwright, Watters, Whyte, Workman.

Regrets: Coté, MacAulay, Treves.

**2000:116.**

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard noted two additional items for consideration under Matters Arising: additions to the graduation list, and the Senate Review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. Mr. Stuttard informed members that he would vacate the Chair for item 5(i), and resume the Chair for 5(ii). The agenda was then **ADOPTED** as amended.

**2000:117.**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The chronology of items was corrected so that minute 2000:107 became 2000:109, minute 2000:108 became 2000:107, and minute 2000:109 became 2000:108. Ms. Guppy pointed out that under what would now become minute 2000:108, Awarding of Degrees, one of the six Master of Urban and Rural Planning degrees awarded had been designated "with distinction." She had been informed that Dalhousie did not award graduate degrees with distinction; however, the former TUNS had awarded graduate degrees "with distinction", and she believed this was an important matter requiring the attention of Senate. Also, under minute 2000:114, Rescinding of Degrees, 1. 2, "Master of Architecture" should read "Master of Urban & Rural Planning." Mr. Rutherford reminded Senators that Dalhousie had not awarded graduate degrees "with distinction" or any other designation for approximately ten years. Ms. Guppy recalled that in 1998 the Faculty of Architecture had awarded two graduate degrees "with distinction." Mr. Stuttard suggested that SCAA was the body which should pursue further discussion of this matter. Mr. El-Hawary believed that after the Dal-TUNS amalgamation the undergraduate program in Engineering had retained the "Sexton" designation. With this as a precedent, he thought the Registrar might look favourably on the matter raised by Ms. Guppy.

The minutes of the meeting of October 16, 2000, were **ADOPTED** as amended.

**2000:118.**

BANNER and Median Grades

Mr. Scully reported that the work on median grades was proceeding as planned, and final testing of this modification of the BANNER program was now underway. He expected that median grades would be available on official student transcripts by December 1, 2000, at the latest, and perhaps as early as mid-November, 2000.

**2000:119.**

Additions to List of Graduates

The Chair read a memorandum from the Dean of Science, Mr. Kimmins, giving the names of three students and the reasons for their delayed addition to the graduation list for October, 2000.

**2000:120.**

Senate Review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies

The Chair reminded members that during the previous discussion of the Senate Review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies Mr. Scully had suggested the location and process for reviews of new program proposals might be changed. Mr. Scully now reported that subsequent discussions with the Acting Dean of Graduate Studies had revealed that some changes could be made within the Faculty of Graduate Studies to expedite reviews of program proposals. Those should be pursued before Senate engaged in further debate on this matter.

Mr. Scully also believed that admissions issues could be addressed within the Faculty of Graduate Studies. Mr. Wainwright asked whether Mr. Caley still intended to bring to the next Senate meeting a report concerning the mechanics of devolving admissions decisions to the line Faculties. Mr. Caley responded that the guidelines which he had proposed bringing forward could be worked out in conjunction with the Acting Dean of Graduate Studies, as Mr. Scully had indicated.

**2000:121.**

Question Period

Mr. Farrell noted that because of changes to the way in which eligibility for scholarships was calculated this year, news of their awards had reached students much later than usual. This had placed extra pressure on students and parents attempting to budget for study at Dalhousie. He understood that the inclusion of summer school grades was part of the problem, but with December 1, 2000, approaching, the continuing uncertainty concerning grade point averages and related financial support was unfortunate. Could the process be expedited? Mr. Traves agreed to convey Mr. Farrell's concerns to the Registrar and to secure additional information for senators.

Mr. Bradfield asked that at the next meeting of Senate members be given information about the number of individuals still working on Banner updates, changes, and implementation of modules, and the main projects on which they were employed. Mr. Scully noted that the Banner system was now integrated into Dalhousie's operations; therefore, in one sense we were all working with it. However, he agreed to bring back to Senate information concerning the sub-teams working on the Banner project in Banner "Manor" I and Banner "Manor" II.

In response to a question from Mr. Bradfield, President Traves explained plans for a 15% administrative charge against the Canada Research Chairs (CRC). Mr. Traves noted that Dalhousie had decided on this levy after consultation with colleagues at other universities about the processes they would be following in administering the CRC. The intention was to apply, within the University, the principle of full-cost recovery in the area of research, which the universities had been urging on the federal government. Approximately two-thirds of the levy would be devoted to necessary renovations of physical space and to necessary research support services within the office of the Vice-President Research; the other one-third would go to offset a host of additional administrative costs. The addition of 43 new and very active research scholars to Dalhousie, all of whom would be successfully pursuing additional research grants and contracts, would create an enormous strain on the already over-burdened resources needed to administer research accounts. Dalhousie could no longer ignore the fact that the functional capacity of our staff was reaching the breaking point. The proposed levy was consistent with the rules and regulations of the Canada Research Chairs program.

In response to a question from Mr. McGrath, Mr. Scully clarified that median grades for the past year and a half during which BANNER had been operating would be available. The capacity to generate median grades was retroactive.

**2000:122.**

Senate Committee on the Environment 1999/2000 Annual Report

Mr. Stuttard noted that Mr. Coté, Chair of the Senate Committee on the Environment (SCE), was in attendance and prepared to answer any questions. On behalf of the SCE, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the Senate Committee on the Environment 1999/2000 Annual Report be adopted.**

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**2000:123.**

Senate Computing & Information Technology Planning Committee (SCITPC) 1999/2000 Annual Report

Mr. Stuttard drew members' attention to correspondence concerning some misunderstandings contained within the Report. The Chair of the Committee, Mr. Sedgwick, had responded to some of the misunderstandings and was in attendance to answer any questions from members. Mr. Scully and Mr. Stuttard drew attention to the "Vision" document update mentioned on page 4 of the Annual Report. Mr. Stuttard clarified that the original "Vision" document had been circulated previously to all senators, and they had clearly understood that this was an interim document. Mr. Scully noted that to this day few Faculties had responded to the original document. In retrospect, it appeared that SCITPC had been significantly ahead of the Faculties, and that the Committee's consultation with Faculties had not been adequate. Even the excellent responses from the Faculties of Health Professions, Management, and Science had been the result of those Faculties' largely independent study of the application of information technology to teaching and research, and not the result of SCITPC's groundwork. Without suggesting any criticism or blame, the lesson appeared to be that a group should engage in substantial consultation before putting forward a large scale plan on something as multi-faceted as information technology. Mr. Stuttard added that when the document had first been presented, the Senate had been primarily concerned with the need for greater input from Faculties.



On behalf of the Senate Computing & Information Technology Planning Committee, and in light of comments just made, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the Senate Computing & Information Technology Planning Committee  
1999/2000 Annual Report be adopted.**

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**2000:124.**

Memorandum of Understanding with Knowledge House Inc. & Knowledge House Limited Partnership  
(through Knowledge House Educational Partnerships)

Mr. Stuttard temporarily relinquished the Chair to the Vice-Chair, Mr. El-Hawary. On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the Senate affirms that transfer credits may be granted only to students  
registered in an academic program at Dalhousie University.**

Mr. Stuttard noted that considerable information on this matter had already been circulated to members of Senate. The Memorandum of Understanding between Dalhousie and Knowledge House Inc. & Knowledge House Limited Partnership included at clause 9(a) a provision that students who completed the Global Baccalaureate, which was to be a Knowledge House product, would be given a Dalhousie transcript and Dalhousie credits. However, there was no requirement that such students ever be registered at Dalhousie. This motion was an attempt to clarify and affirm the existing University regulation that no student who did not register at Dalhousie could receive a Dalhousie transcript. Mr. Farrell believed that many senators had heard more about this memorandum through rumour and word-of-mouth than through circulated material. The University community was leery of tips of ice-burges which left confusion over such key issues as the status of the Memorandum of Understanding and the partnership with Knowledge House. Was the Memorandum already in effect? Were these motions from SAPBC attempting to prevent something from happening, to correct something which had already happened, or to ensure that something which had already taken place did not happen again? Was Dalhousie already party to a five-year binding agreement?

Mr. Stuttard responded that all Senators had received copies of the Memorandum of Understanding, email exchanges generated by the Memorandum, and draft excerpts of the SAPBC meeting of October 2, 2000, where these three motions had been discussed. One of the problems with the Memorandum was that on its face it was a contract. Mr. Stuttard was not a lawyer, but he had been told by lawyers that indeed it was a contract. However, it contained provisions which at the moment could not be fulfilled. Clause 9(a) was one of these. SAPBC was bringing this motion forward to make clear, in a public fashion, that this provision concerning transfer credits could not be put into effect.

Mr. Scully considered three motions on the agenda to be unexceptional, and indicated that he would support all three, as would the President were he still in attendance. Ms. Binkley asked whether this motion was addressing the question of admission requirements, as set out in the University Calendar, and as they might relate to Knowledge House students. At one point, some members of the University community had been told that applicants to the Knowledge House program would be students who had dropped out of University at Christmas, or those whose high school grades made them ineligible for direct admission to Dalhousie. The program had been presented as a way to help individuals bring up their grades. Would we be applying the same admission criteria used at Dalhousie to those students who

registered in the Global Baccalaureate?

Mr. Stuttard reiterated that the motion referred to the Dalhousie policy of granting transfer credits only to students who registered at Dalhousie. The Memorandum provided for the issuing of transfer credits and a transcript to students who never registered at Dalhousie. The question of admission to Dalhousie was a different question and was dealt with under clause 9(b). Issues relating to admission and standards for admission might be the subject of further motions by Senate or SAPBC.

Mr. Jalilvand asked whether the motion applied to the practice of offering conditional acceptance to some students? Once such students had satisfied the conditions attached to their admission could we not provide them with credit for their work? Mr. El-Hawary's understanding was that Faculties could admit students conditionally; evaluate those students' credits from other institutions, once they had been admitted; and then make the appropriate recommendations to the Registrar. Mr. Jalilvand saw the issue as one of dealing with emerging markets. Many universities deliberately invested considerable energy in attempting to bring students in emerging markets up to the level at which they would meet the criteria for admission. Would this motion deny to Dalhousie the opportunity to work with potential students from segments of international markets who under normal circumstances could not be admitted to university? Mr. Stuttard did not see points raised by Mr. Jalilvand as relevant to the present discussion of giving transcripts to students who had not been admitted to Dalhousie.

Mr. Wainwright understood that the motion was intended to affirm Dalhousie's general policy concerning transfer credits, but it was also directed at the awarding of transfer credits as set out in the Memorandum. He believed Senate needed the opportunity to discuss the nature of the transfer credits envisioned by the agreement with Knowledge House. While he was willing to agree with the general statement that transfer credits could be granted only to students registered at Dalhousie University, he did not wish that to be interpreted as approval of the Knowledge House transfer credits. Mr. El-Hawary assured Mr. Wainwright that if further issues arose during the discussion in Senate, they would be referred back to SAPBC.

Mr. Bradfield assumed that this motion was only clarifying one aspect of transfer credits, and that Dalhousie's other provisions concerning transfer credits, such as minimum standards, would also apply to the agreement with Knowledge House. The fact that the other provisions were not mentioned did not mean they were not in force. Mr. Bradfield also asked Mr. Scully to clarify his position that the motions were non-controversial and that he could support them. The motions appeared to directly and explicitly contradict statements in the Memorandum. What did that do to the status of the Memorandum? Mr. Scully took Mr. Bradfield's comments as applying to motions one and three, not two. Speaking to the third motion, Mr. Scully explained that it had always been the understanding that the Senate would have to give approval to the participation of Faculties in this program, which was a Knowledge House program, not a Dalhousie program. As for motion one, for students to gain access to any of the aspects of the Memorandum they would have to be admitted to Dalhousie. Mr. Bradfield repeated the provision in clause 9(a) that any student who passed the program at Knowledge House would receive a Dalhousie transcript within 15 days. He interpreted that as a direct contradiction of established practice at Dalhousie. Mr. Scully acknowledged that in logical terms there was a contradiction. That said, he could still support the motion on the table.

Ms. Bleasdale explained that the SAPBC was bringing these motions forward in order to achieve greater clarity on the Memorandum itself, on the process by which it had been reached, and on any future steps which Senate or SAPBC might need to take in this area. These motions highlighted some, but not all, of the issues discussed at SAPBC, and they represented an attempt to move carefully to understand, retroactively, what had happened, and to clarify what we wished to see happen in the future. All of the

issues being raised would presumably become the subject of further discussion. Eventually, Senate might wish to consider other motions concerning the Memorandum and the partnership with Knowledge House.

Mr. Brett was concerned that the motion did not resolve the difficulty. Even if we passed this motion, those who had signed this agreement might argue that Dalhousie was obliged to admit individuals within fifteen days of their successful completion of the Knowledge House Global Baccalaureate. The motion required a clause at the end which stipulated, "the student having been admitted in accordance with normal procedures." Mr. Brett thought that a person who had entered into this agreement under the assumption that this was a way to gain entrance to Dalhousie might be surprised and disturbed to discover that Dalhousie did not believe that. Mr. El-Hawary thought the suggested amendment was implicit in the motion, but he would be prepared to accept such an amendment in the interests of greater clarity.

Assuming that the motion passed, Mr. Tindall saw clause 16 of the Memorandum of Understanding as having a direct bearing on future developments. Under clause 16, the partnership could be terminated if either party committed a material breach of the Memorandum. If Dalhousie refused to honour clause 9(a), would it be committing such a material breach? Mr. Scully responded, no. In conversations with Knowledge House, which went back to the fall of 1999 and had been initiated in the Faculty of Science, the parties had always understood that the Memorandum represented a developmental framework within which discussions would advance. This was a legal document and it was binding, but within a framework of collaboration. Mr. Bradfield recalled that at SAPBC the University's legal counsel had indicated that although this was a legal document, the two parties were traveling down the road in good faith, with the power to separate if they could not reach a final, binding agreement. The Memorandum had been presented as one from which we could retreat, if major problems arose down the line. Clause 9(a) was only one of a number of possible problems emerging. How binding was the contract? There were also questions as to whether Knowledge House had operated in good faith.

Mr. Roberts noted that two individuals had signed this Memorandum on behalf of Dalhousie, but that Mr. Scully was being required to answer a lot of questions. He felt for Mr. Scully, and he wondered why the President was not here to speak to these matters. Mr. Stuttard explained that at the beginning of the meeting the President had indicated that he had a conflicting meeting at 4:30 p.m., and did not know whether he would be back before this meeting ended.

Mr. Wainwright asked the Vice-President whether he saw this motion as taking care of what he had admitted was a logical contradiction. How did Mr. Scully interpret this motion? Was it an alternative to part of the Memorandum? Why were we not passing a motion which eliminated the contradiction rather than leaving the Memorandum in tact? Mr. Scully repeated that he could support this motion. He respected the rules and regulations of this University and of the Senate. In due course he believed this issue would be clarified.

Mr. Ugursal did not understand why senators were concerned over the contradiction. The University would continue to work according to its established rules, with or without this Memorandum. If the President or the Board of Governors signed an agreement which contradicted the University's academic regulations and processes, that was not the Senate's responsibility. Nor was it the Senate's problem to try to find a solution to an agreement which could not be implemented. He hoped Senate would pass the three motions, but he found them unnecessary.

Ms. Binkley drew an analogy with the way in which Dalhousie dealt with credits for the International Baccalaureate and with Advanced Placement. The Senate Committee on Academic Administration could look at work completed at Knowledge House, decide it was equivalent to a number of our classes, and

grant a student transfer credits. For students admitted to the Faculties of Science or Management, we could decide to accept credits from Knowledge House as credits towards programs within those Faculties.

Also, we could furnish a transcript crediting specific work, and the University of Toronto or Queens University, say, could then decide whether to accept that work as transfer credits. Mr. Stuttard responded that Ms. Binkley was correct with respect to clause 9(b); however, the present motion addressed clause 9(a).

Mr. Girard thought SAPBC had done well in clarifying some aspects of this agreement. He thought the motions were useful. The unease he heard did not appear to be directly related to the three motions before Senate. He thought we should pass these motions, then individuals could suggest additional motions concerning the Memorandum, if they so chose.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the President and Vice-President Academic and Provost sign no further contracts that would commit Dalhousie to initiate academic programs with external partners until this Senate has expressed its wishes on the matter.**

Mr. Stuttard explained that this motion addressed some of the questions raised during discussion of the first motion. If administrators signed memoranda of understanding without first referring them to the Senate, they ran the risk of committing Dalhousie to agreements which contradicted or were at variance with senators' understanding of regulations and processes at Dalhousie. This motion was simply to put the President and Vice-President Academic and Provost on notice that this body was anxious to see the proposed provisions of any future contracts.

Ms. McIntyre understood that Senate wanted to approve programs and that administrators could not commit to programs prior to receiving the approval of Senate. But in some circumstances administrators needed to sign letters of intent or memoranda of agreement before negotiating with other parties. The Faculty of Health Professions provided memoranda of understanding when SAPBC was reviewing their proposals, and clearly stated that programs required Senate approval. However, the wording of this motion was overly restrictive and could preclude the signing of agreements necessary to the exploration of possible partnerships and programs. In a recent communication concerning a proposed new program, Mr. Stuttard had begun by asking whether he could see the memorandum of agreement. We needed to protect the integrity of the University, but we also needed to be flexible to allow for negotiations. Mr. Stuttard responded that the key word was "commit". If the memorandum of understanding clearly set out the requirement for Senate approval, it was not a commitment. Ms. McIntyre thought one could argue it was a commitment, provided Senate agreed.

Mr. Emodi considered "initiate" the key word in the motion. He was also troubled that the term "external partners" was too general. For example, the Faculty of Architecture had a memorandum of understanding with the University of the Gambia and considering working on an academic program with Acadia University. Under this provision, would they have to submit such arrangements to this Senate prior to working on such arrangements. If that was the case, Mr. Emodi would vote no. But he had no problem with the provision if his Faculty was able to work on a program. Mr. Stuttard responded that a Faculty could work on a program, but could not commit to actually giving that program.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That Dalhousie shall provide to Knowledge House Inc. and Knowledge House Limited Partnership confirmation of which Faculties are Participating Faculties, in accordance with section 4 of the Memorandum of Understanding, only after Senate has given its approval.**

Mr. Stuttard explained that this motion was a safeguard against any Faculty separately notifying Knowledge House that it agreed to be a Participating Faculty. Once there was a Participating Faculty then the various provisions of the Memorandum would come into play; without a Participating Faculty, the Memorandum essentially had no effect, since students were to be admitted to a specific program in a specific Participating Faculty.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

To clarify a response given by the Chair *pro tem*, Mr. Stuttard noted that absentions were non-votes, and that Senate minutes only recorded whether more votes were cast in favour of or against a motion. A member could request that the votes for and against be counted. Any member could also request a secret ballot or a standing count, and no member was obliged to vote on an issue. But it was the responsibility of senators to come to a meeting prepared and prepared to vote, unless they had a conflict of interest.

Mr. Jalilvand understood that the three motions just passed were intended to ensure that the role of the Senate was respected, and he supported that whole-heartedly. But he believed Senate also had a another role. The material concerning Knowledge House was intended to open up possibilities for Dalhousie in the area of information technology, and to provide students and faculty members with a broader future in which they could be more competitive. Mr. Jalilvand found it interesting that during the previous discussion nothing had been said about what we were supposed to do with respect to information technology. Was there a mechanism for enabling us to start talking about these issues? Mr. Stuttard noted that the material circulated with the motions included discussion of three general questions he had raised in SAPBC, one of which addressed on-line education. He had asked whether Dalhousie had a policy and strategy for on-line education. The Senate Steering Committee had discussed that question and had suggested the formation of a Task Force on the issue. After further consideration and recent discussions with Vice President Scully, the Senate Committee on Instructional Development appeared to be the appropriate Senate Committee, or the Committee which was attempting to make itself appropriate, to undertake a study and suggest policies in the area of on-line education. That Committee's mandate would need to be broadened, but its Chair, Mr. Tim Lee, was already discussing that possibility with President Traves and would be pursuing discussions with Mr. Scully. Mr. Stuttard expected Senate would be receiving a proposal to expand the mandate of SCID in the near future. Mr. Jalilvand trusted that Committee would produce an approach which was sufficiently flexible to meet the challenges of a fluid, expanding and competitive area. Mr. El-Hawary assured Mr. Javiland that the Deans' Council would be included in the discussions.

Mr. Stuttard was pleased that Senate had passed these three motions; however, the question of what to do with the Memorandum of Understanding remained. To clear the air and to address broader issues which had been raised, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the terms of the Knowledge House-Dalhousie Memorandum of Understanding were unsatisfactory to Dalhousie, and therefore it was incumbent on the parties to nullify this agreement.**

Ms. McIntyre spoke strongly against the motion. She believed Mr. Ugursal had been clear and correct in arguing that Senate was entrusted with the academic governance of this University, and it was up to the administration to manage the internal affairs and external relations of Dalhousie. We knew Senate's position; now we needed to allow the administration to respond to the suggestions from Senate. Senate did not have the authority to nullify agreements. The possibilities for amendments and renegotiation were clear, but those were administrative issues and were not the business of Senate.

Ms. Bleasdale indicated that a the major concern of those who had been wrestling with the Memorandum for a number of months was that Knowledge House continued to advertise its partnership with Dalhousie. Some members might have noticed that over the preceding weeks the nature of that advertising had changed subtly, and direct queries to Knowledge House now described a slightly different program than the one outlined in the Memorandum. That only added to the confusion not just of members of the Dalhousie community, but, more importantly, to the confusion of potential students trying to find out exactly what is was they might be able to take from Knowledge House that might potentially transfer into credits from Dalhousie. Dalhousie was still publicly identified with an agreement and a partnership which did not fall within the rules and operational procedures of Dalhousie, as they had now been affirmed by Senate. Ms. Bleasdale was very concerned that Knowledge House might be trading inappropriately on Dalhousie's good name by continuing to advertise this program. Dalhousie needed to publicly clarify its relationship with Knowledge House in order to protect itself and to protect potential students.

Mr. Jalilvand asked whether the motion was asking for clarification or was calling for the nullification of the Memorandum. He noted that we had just passed three motions which established guidelines concerning entering into this kind of agreement. If the parties now attempted to clarify this agreement would that be satisfactory to the mover of the motion? We needed to wait and see what the parties would do, given the motions which had been passed, and if their actions were not satisfactory then a stronger motion could be moved. Mr. Stuttard responded that the motion was asking the parties, not the Senate, to nullify the Memorandum of Understanding.

Mr. Farrell noted that the three motions just passed referred to what should not happen in the future. But did that leave us in the position that someone might say they had not done anything illegal, and they promised not to do it again? He asked whether actions which had by-passed Senate were de facto nullified. Could a contract arrived at without due process be binding? Did we have any choice but to start over?

Mr. Ugursal understood that students might start suing Knowledge House for not delivering on its promises, or Knowledge House might sue Dalhousie; however, this was not a matter for Senate. If Knowledge House sued the University, the Board would find the money for the legal action and the judge's ruling would be enforced. But nobody could force the Senate to grant a degree to someone who did not deserve a degree according to Senate regulations. Mr. Grath asked whether there was a precedent within Dalhousie for students to be the guinea pigs of such agreements and memoranda of understanding. As the academic governing body, he believed Senate should take all necessary steps to prevent this type of thing from happening again.

Mr. Caley was uncomfortable nullifying a memorandum of which he had seen only one component. Was Senate being asked to nullify the entire Memorandum or only its unacceptable aspects? Mr. Stuttard reiterated that Senate could not nullify the Memorandum. The motion called on the parties to nullify the agreement. At present, public advertising linked Dalhousie and Knowledge House as partners in a

program that could not be implemented. Until Dalhousie disassociated itself from that program, potential students were being told there was a program for them to take. He did not know what the consequences of that would be, but it was cause for concern. This was a public meeting, and by adopting this motion Senate could at least publicly disassociate this body from that Memorandum.

Mr. Emodi did not know enough about the Memorandum to vote to call on the University to nullify it. He agreed with Mr. Ugursal that this did not seem to be the business of Senate. He also supported the Dean of Management's position that this was an area we should be working to develop. None of the motions addressed that particular point. Mr. Emodi urged Senators to ask the University legal counsel for his opinion of events surrounding the Memorandum. If there were academic implications, that made it Senate business. But since this was an unexamined motion, coming from an individual, not a Senate committee, he was not prepared to support it.

For the reasons advanced by the previous speaker, Mr. Poel found this motion inappropriate, vague, and misguided. Members should be provided with written notice of a motion this significant. Rather than continuing to waste Senate's time, we should either table the motion until we had a clearer sense of what was intended, or we should vote it down. He would vote against it. Mr. Scully thought the best method of proceeding was to ask the President how he proposed to respond to the motions passed by Senate. He thought this course of action would be more respectful than the current motion.

In response to a question from Mr. Jalilvand, Mr. Stuttard explained that this motion had not been discussed at SAPBC, only at Senate. Many red herrings were floating around. But he presented it as a logical extension of the three motions already passed. He had indicated the motion was not meant to offend anyone, but in the discussion of the three previous motions Senate had agreed that the Memorandum of Understanding was unsatisfactory to Dalhousie. If something was unsatisfactory, you sought to change it.

Mr. Tindell moved:

**That the motion be referred to SAPBC for comment and that SAPBC report back to Senate.**

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Farrell reminded members that we had agreed to open up the floor to discussion of further motions. He did not see how the motion was disrespectful, or how, by expressing concern for procedure, Senators could be seen as opposed to technological innovations in teaching. He thought Dalhousie was perhaps fifteen years behind what it should be doing in this area due to other budgetary constraints. But he wished to underline that Senators' concern here was with procedures.

Whether or not it was the responsibility of Senate to nullify this Memorandum, Mr. Wainwright saw many aspects of the agreement directly related to academic programs, which fell with Senate's purview. The memorandum from the University legal counsel to the Chair of Senate confirmed this. In considering whether to throw out the Memorandum, Senate was approaching the issues from the top down. Mr. Wainwright advised Senate to move from the bottom up, debating each issue to see whether there was a Memorandum left.

Mr. Stuttard resumed the Chair.

**2000.125.**

Canada Research Chairs & Strategic Research Plan

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

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

Mr. Tindall asked whether the Strategic Research Plan had been circulated to Senate. Mr. Stuttard responded that it was on the Dalhousie website under research. Mr. Bradfield referred to the minutes of the October 2, 2000, meeting of SAPBC at which he at raised concerns about process. Senators had been told at a previous meeting that these Chairs represented one of the ways in which we could increase complement. That made it particularly inappropriate and disappointing to have decision-making dominated by the administration with very little input from Senate bodies and processes. Despite a consensus at SAPBC that the Vice-President Research should address this problem, no changes had been made to the document coming before Senate. To date, the process and the document gave Mr. Bradfield little reason to hope that Senate and Senate's committees would be consulted in a timely fashion which would enable them to have input into changing the document, or, more importantly, making the appointments. The process over the summer had not worked to protect faculty at Dalhousie from raiding by other Universities. Nominations had been solicited from departments, but at the end of the summer departments were told that only two of the recommendations would go forward. By implication, it now seemed that a number of individuals who had originally agreed to have their names go forward were not good enough to be considered in the first round by Dalhousie. Yet some of them had been approached by other Universities, which suggested our process had not protected the people we had hoped to protect.

Ms. Binkley reminded members of the earlier plan prepared for the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), a much broader plan that had looked at all of the research work on campus. For example, there were areas in the areas of Social Sciences and Humanities which were addressed in that earlier CFI plan which were not even thought about when we looked at the strategic plan concerning the CRCs. When a number of individuals had pointed to the broad areas of research strength not included in the CRC Strategic Plan, they had been told that the Strategic Plan related only to the CRCs, and the CFI Plan was the larger research plan. If Senate was going to discuss a Strategic Research Plan she would prefer we talked about the CFI Plan, because the CRC Plan was very narrow and designated limited resources for a particular reason.

Mr. Scully hoped we could return to this item at the next meeting, when he would try to respond to the various comments made. The CRC program was an attempt to set particular research directions for the institution, under a particular program. This was one important vehicle among many which were attempting to set directions for Dalhousie. There had been very little limited opportunity for consultation in the summer. Now was the time for consultation. We needed to hear ideas for improving the plan now.

Ms. Binkley moved:

**That consideration of the CRC be postponed to the next meeting of Senate.**

The motion was **CARRIED.**



**2000:126.**

Ex-Officio Members of Senate

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the ex-officio members of Senate include the Vice-President Research in place of the Principal of DalTech.**

Mr. Ugursal asked why the Vice-President Research had not been a member of Senate previously. He supported inclusion of the Vice-President Research; however, he found it objectionable that the position should be substituted for the Principal of DalTech. The Amalgamation agreement had included provision for a Principal for the former TUNS. The agreement had been done away with, but it would have been more seemly to delete the Principal of DalTech and add the new Vice-President Research separately. Mr. Stuttard provided some background to the motion. The duties of the Principal were now in the hands of the Vice-President Academic and Provost, already a member of the Senate. That meant the number of ex-officio members had dropped from 16 to 15. Since one factor determining the membership of Senate was the one to three ratio between ex-officio and elected members, Senate was now being asked to restore the appropriate ratio by adding one administrator. Of the 23 members who had responded to the email concerning the proposed addition of the Vice-President Research, 17 had agreed that that official should become a member of Senate. Ms. Watters added that prior to the appointment of Mr. Breckenridge as Vice-President Research Dalhousie had had an Associate Vice-President Research.

Mr. Whyte moved an amendment:

**That a period be inserted after "Research" and that the remainder of the motion be deleted.**

The amendment was **CARRIED**.

The amended motion:

**That the ex-officio members of Senate include the Vice-President Research.**

was **CARRIED**.

Ms. Binkley moved:

**That the title "Principal of DalTech" be deleted from the ex-officio members of Senate.**

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**2000:127.**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

