

Item: Senate Minutes, January 2001
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for January 2001. 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, January 15, 2001, 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, Breckenridge, Brett, Caldwell, Caley, Cochrane, Cunningham, Devlin, Downe-Wamboldt, El-Hawary, Emodi, Fraser, Giacomantonio, Girard, Guppy, Hart, Harvey, Ipson, Jalilvand, Johnston, Kay-Raining Bird, Kemp, Kimmins, Lohmann, MacAulay, N. MacDonald, R. MacDonald, MacInnis, MacLean, Maes, McAlister, McGrath, McIntyre, Neves, Pacey, Roberts, Rowe, Rutherford, Sastri, Scott, Scully, Slonim, Starnes, Tindall, Traves, Ugursal, Wainwright, Watters, Whyte.

Regrets: Ben-Abdallah, Coffin, Cox, Murphy, Phillips, Russell, Savoy, Treves.

2001:01.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

2001:02.

Minutes of November 20, 2000, Meeting

i) Approval

With minor typographical corrections, the minutes were approved as circulated.

ii) Matters arising

a) Knowledge House Memorandum of Understanding

The Chair reported that the motion previously referred to the SAPBC:

That the terms of the KHI-KHLP-Dalhousie Memorandum of Understanding are unsatisfactory to Dalhousie; therefore, it is incumbent on the Parties to nullify this agreement.

had been considered by that Committee on January 8, 2001, and draft minutes had been circulated to all senators by e-mail. Most of the second paragraph of those minutes had been prepared by Mr. Traves and enclosed with the agenda for this meeting. Mr. Stuttard read the second paragraph of the draft SAPBC minutes as a statement from the SAPBC regarding the referred motion:

Mr. Traves reported that the interest in the initial project between the University and the

Company had changed significantly, and that the project was no longer under development. The Company was still interested in obtaining advice from Dalhousie faculty members on curriculum development for a different project they were pursuing, and faculty members involved were obviously entitled to work on this in their capacity as consultants. In the event that any new proposal were to emerge for an arrangement between Knowledge House and any Faculty at Dalhousie, it was understood, as per the motions passed at Senate, that such proposals must first be approved by the Faculty involved and then by the Senate before any new initiatives could commence. Mr. Traves believed that because the project which prompted the May 31 MoU had now changed significantly and the Company was no longer developing that original project, the sense of the motion referred from the Senate had been fulfilled.

Mr. Bradfield observed that the Vice-President Academic and Provost, Mr. Scully, had undertaken to contact Knowledge House to convey to them the SAPBC's concern that the *Global Baccalaureate* should not be advertised on the Company's web site as a product involving Dalhousie University. Mr. Scully confirmed that he had conveyed that concern to the Company and was awaiting their response.

In response to Mr. Tindall, Mr. Stuttard clarified that the statement from SAPBC did not include a motion for the Senate.

Mr. Wainwright was puzzled by Mr. Scully's answer. It seemed that Knowledge House had no business advertising a partnership with Dalhousie when the project was no longer under development.

Mr. Scully noted that it was the Company's web site, and added that it contained information which was historically accurate. He agreed to report back to the next meeting of Senate. Mr. Stuttard reported that as of 3:31 pm that day the *Global Baccalaureate* was still advertised on the KH Products and Services web page, including, at the fifth paragraph, the words:

"A series of multi-disciplinary modules are being designed and developed in partnership with Dalhousie University faculty and business and industry advisors. Program graduates will receive advanced placement and five, full-year credits towards a 20-credit degree program from Dalhousie University."

Mr. Bradfield commented that this sounded like a significant mention of Dalhousie that raised two problems: first, that Dalhousie's name was still on the KH web page; and second, that the Memorandum of Understanding had included a commitment from the Company not to use the University's logo (and logo included Dalhousie's name) without permission.

Mr. Traves believed that Dalhousie's intentions and expectations were clear, and he looked forward to Mr. Scully's report at the next Senate meeting. Ms. MacDonald suggested that the University could publish a disclaimer on its own web site.

Ms. Ozier, a non-senator, was recognized; she asked whether Mr. Scully could explain how the Knowledge House web site was historically accurate. Since there had never been a participating Faculty at Dalhousie, the *Global Baccalaureate* description could not be accurate.

b) Program Approvals by MPHEC

The Chair reported that the MPHEC had approved the M.Eng.(Petroleum Engineering) and BAppl.Sci.(Food Science) degree programs; he noted that the latter degree name omitted the word “technology” which had been attached to it in error when the Senate and Board had approved the proposal.

2001:03.

Question Period

Mr. R. MacDonald made a plea for greater coordination in the allocation of learning assignments, especially for 3rd and 4th year students, to avoid excessive workloads. Mr. Scully believed this question would be more effectively addressed to individual departments.

Ms. MacAulay requested an update on in-course scholarships: how many students were affected? Mr. Traves had asked the Registrar to look into the matter, and she was working to make the appropriate changes.

Mr. McGrath was concerned that the approved minutes of the October 16th Senate meeting, now available on the Senate web page, included inappropriate reference to a decision made *in camera*. The Chair noted that those minutes had been duly approved by the Senate, but could be further amended at any time. Mr. Kimmins asked if the Senate should have a policy on this, with more specific advice regarding the reporting of *in camera* items.

The Secretary of Senate, Ms. Bleasdale, apologized to the meeting, but noted that action to rescind a degree would have to be recorded. She acknowledged that, perhaps, she could have found a more appropriate way of reporting the particular *in camera* decision in question.

Mr. Kimmins suggested that action taken *in camera* could be recorded without reporting the name of the individual concerned. However, Mr. Bradfield argued that any motion passed *in camera* should be recorded in the minutes, although the discussion should not.

Mr. Bradfield returned to an earlier matter and asked whether the Board of Governors had considered the Knowledge House Memorandum of Understanding. Mr. Stuttard responded that it had not, but it had taken note of Senate’s motion regarding the signing of contracts by the President and Vice-President Academic & Provost.

Ms. Binkley praised the new, “Tiger in the jungle” advertisement for the Commerce program; her casual observation at a local entertainment venue suggested that the advertisement was very effective with the target age group.

Mr. Wainwright wondered whether everyone at Board meetings always spoke in short-hand, given the very abbreviated minutes that were published. Mr. Traves recognized this reference to “Board Notes” in the Public Notice Digest provided by e-mail to the University community and explained that these were not the actual Board minutes, but the actual minutes were available to the public on request. Mr. Wainwright suggested perhaps some type of compromise version could be produced for the Notice Digest. Mr. Traves thought that a worthwhile suggestion and would pass it on.

Mr. McGrath asked Mr. Traves for an update on the new FASS Building. He was particularly interested in the cladding which had prompted considerable discussion across the campus because of its cheap

appearance. Mr. Traves assured the meeting that the cladding was not cheap. The original design had been to mimic the local area streetscape to generate the feel of houses, but also to produce a townhouse look; for University Avenue frontage, a decision had been taken to follow the “institutional” stone image. The cladding material was a type of concrete with the appearance of wood. It was sturdy, non-flammable, and very low cost for maintenance because the colour was incorporated into the material.

2001:04.

SAPBC:

Proposed new Department of International Development Studies

On behalf of the SAPBC, the Chair moved:

That the proposal to establish a Department of International Development Studies within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences be approved.

Mr. Brett noted that the proposed Department would be responsible for a multi-disciplinary program currently involving faculty from twelve departments. It was the fastest growing program in the Faculty. The new Department would not entail any increased costs, and the number of support staff would remain the same.

Mr. Fraser commended those involved in the IDS program over the years, and looked forward to further initiatives from the Department in the future.

The motion was CARRIED.

2001:05.

SCAA:

i) B.Sc. (Kinesiology) Honours Conversion

On behalf of the SCAA, Mr. Scully moved:

That the proposal to permit the conversion of a B.Sc. (Kinesiology) degree to a B.Sc. (Kinesiology Honours) degree be approved.

Mr. McGrath inquired as to the effective date for students to avail themselves of this conversion. The Chair responded that anyone who fulfilled requirements in the current year would be eligible.

ii) Calendar of Dates

Mr. Scully moved:

THAT the Fall term shall begin on Thursday, September 6, 2001, and end on Monday, December 3, 2001, with an exam period Wednesday, December 5 to Saturday, December 15, 2001; and that the Winter term shall begin on Monday, January 7, 2002, and end on Tuesday, April 9, 2002, with an exam period Friday, April 12 to Saturday, April 27, 2002.

Mr. Scully reported that the SCAA had spent considerable time in deciding on this recommendation. Three options had been considered, each of which differed from the others only in the second term. The final dates represented a compromise to allow two clear days before the start of exams in April. He

believed the whole academic calendar ought to be revisited as soon as possible, including the dates of convocation.

Mr. Slonim observed that the Fall term would start on Thursday which, compared with travelling on the weekend for a Monday start, would increase the cost for students travelling to Halifax. Mr. Scully countered that many students arrived some days before the start of the Fall term. On the other hand, Mr. Brett gave a teacher's perspective: that because of costs many students, particularly in 3rd year, failed to appear for Thursday and Friday classes at the start of the Fall term.

Ms. McIntyre reminded senators that student orientation was an issue, and one outcome of the Metro Universities Consortium Agreement had been the common starting dates for classes.

Mr. Emodi commented that for faculty running a full summer term, the compression between terms would be an issue. Mr. Scully acknowledged that this had not been considered.

The motion was CARRIED.

2001:06.

Senate Library Committee:

Report on "Amalgamation of Science Services with Social Sciences and Humanities in the Killam Memorial Library"

The Chair of the Senate Library Committee, Mr. Frank Smith, summarized his report. The referral from the Senate had presented the SLC with two issues: one regarding the substance of their ultimate report; the other, the process to be followed by the Committee. For reasons outlined in their report the Senate Library Committee established a subcommittee which excluded members with direct interest in the outcome, and was thus seen as impartial. With regard to substance, the subcommittee requested input from the University Librarian, the Dean of the Faculty of Science, heads of other units on campus, and students. The resulting report was as balanced as the Committee could make it. The first three recommendations addressed issues raised by Faculty of Science, but all four recommendations stressed the need for improved communication.

While the recommendations may not have resolved the issue, they were recommendations for action to ameliorate the situation. Mr. Smith called on senators to remember that issues involving the Library affected many academic units. The University Library was in very difficult position, and moves to new technologies needed to be balanced with continuing traditional demands.

On behalf of the SLC, the Chair moved:

That the report of the Senate Library Committee, Amalgamation of Science Services with Social Sciences and Humanities Services in the Killam Memorial Library, be adopted.

Mr. McGrath queried two words in the first recommendation: "articulating" and "consultation". Mr. Smith explained that "articulating" was meant to cover all forms of communication of the Library's strategic plan to the Dalhousie community; "consultation" suggested that that plan would be developed with feedback from members of University community.

Mr. Scott asked what acceptance of report would mean. Would it mean acceptance of the fact of

amalgamation, and did the report include the covering letter? Mr. Stuttard replied that the covering letter was not part of the report.

Mr. Smith explained that in the covering letter the whole Senate Library Committee had clarified the main points of the report.

Mr. Kimmins congratulated Mr. Smith and his colleagues on producing a well-constructed report of one of the most thorough investigations of an issue by a Senate Committee, for which the Senate owed them a vote of thanks. However, he questioned the logic of their conclusion that amalgamation was justified, given the information contained in the preceding pages. He raised two serious issues. Firstly, the role of non-academic units in the University: the report included the fact that he had emphasized his Faculty's view that the role of the Library in the University was a support service. Perhaps it was considered quaint to believe that a support unit's role was to give support, because there was an increasing sense among support units that their role was to control rather than give assistance.

Mr. Kimmins' second issue was about the process of amalgamation, and referred to the goals defined on page seven of the report. The first two of these were the rationalization of collections and services, but after amalgamation neither of these was better for science students and faculty than before the amalgamation. Mr. Kimmins characterized the pre-amalgamation services as second to none. Now, the Science collection was arguably more fragmented than it had been, and "one-stop shopping" no longer existed. The Report did mention the recent difficulties evident since amalgamation, and Mr. Kimmins was thankful for that. He also thanked the Committee for the list on pages 19 and 20 concerning improvements that were still necessary. To adopt the report meant acceptance of the four recommendations with which he could not disagree. Had those been the goals in past, the current situation would not have arisen.

Mr. Pacey asked whether the more than 200 communications received by the subcommittee from students had been signed, and had those students been provided with copies of the report?

Mr. Smith explained that he had a thick binder full of these communications, not all of which had identifiable authors. For logistical reasons it was not possible to communicate the report to all interested parties. The report was made to the Senate and all members had received copies. He hoped the report would be made available more widely in some fashion.

Mr. Pacey argued that there had been an enormous response from students, but because the Report had only been received on the preceding Thursday, there had been little time to consider it before this meeting. He believed it should be more widely disseminated across the campus, possibly in the *Gazette*. This would be a courtesy, at least to the those who had given their input to the Committee. Mr. Pacey then moved:

That the question be deferred to the next meeting of Senate.

Mr. Maes expressed concern that uncertainty about the amalgamation was long-standing and had crippled the Library's functions. He had agreed not to make further changes until the report had been submitted and accepted. To delay the question for a further two weeks would put the Library in limbo.

The motion was LOST.

Returning to the main motion, Mr. Scott saw no basis for the report's conclusion; for example, with

respect to service, Science librarians were unavailable until 11:00 in the morning. Mr. Maes explained that staffing of Science reference desk was decided by the librarians, but if this was failing, then he would ensure that service was restored to the pre-amalgamation level.

Mr. Wainwright thought the report was curious since it did not make the case for amalgamation. Pages six and seven gave reasons for amalgamation, but they did not follow the preceding analysis. The recommendations really were what should have been done before such a major decision was made.

Mr. Smith explained that the subcommittee had not considered it to be their responsibility to make a judgement on the virtues of amalgamation, but did reach a consensus that there were merits to the amalgamation.

With respect to process, Ms. N. MacDonald noted that the issue had been referred to the Senate Library Committee with the expectation of extensive consultation. Now their report must be accepted or rejected.

Mr. Pacey identified a further problem with the report: one recommendation called for the Library to develop a strategic plan. But this was a responsibility of the Senate. Therefore, the Senate Library Committee should develop the strategic plan for the University Library.

Mr. Devlin commented as a member of the Senate Library Committee that while the report's arguments in favour of amalgamation were short, length was not necessarily a measure of strength.

Ms. Bleasdale wondered what would happen tomorrow if the Report was adopted. Mr. Roberts believed that many students would be upset.

Mr. Traves disputed the validity of petitions in decision-making. The larger question was the debate over the status-quo versus change. But there was no esteemed status-quo. No one was entirely happy with the Library, and any avoidance of this reality was personally disturbing to him. To dig in one's heels against change was not helpful. He believed that the report's recommendations were appropriate, and in the end he hoped that the Library's changes would be positive.

Mr. Emodi saw the Library as struggling to balance demands; the report appeared to find that the amalgamation was justified, and the Senate could be very clear on Recommendations two and four.

Ms. Bleasdale was unclear on how Mr. Maes would balance the call for further consultation; it would be a difficult task. Mr. Maes responded that he would sit down with his staff and members of the Faculty of Science. He would follow Recommendation 3 as clarified in the SLC's covering letter. However, he was concerned that the Library had not been given adequate time to follow through on the process.

Mr. Ugursal moved that the question be called. The required two-thirds majority agreed and in the subsequent vote the Senate Library Committee report was ADOPTED.

2001:07.

President's Report

Mr. Traves reported that the former home of Sociology and Social Anthropology had been demolished to make way for a new student residence and day-care building which would be constructed and

operated by a private company. Dalhousie was providing the land, and the apartments would be available only to Dalhousie students. After 40 years, the building would revert to the University. Provision of more student residences was seen as important for recruitment.

The Board was also considering an addition to Howe Hall which would add about 160 beds by completing the fourth side of the present building without loss of any parking spaces. Builders had been asked to come forward with proposals for the construction, but the University would own and operate the new building as part of the existing Howe Hall.

The Board of Governors' *ad hoc* Facilities Renewal Strategy Committee had completed a substantial report on an estimated \$140m backlog of deferred campus maintenance. The discussion document was about to be circulated to the Senate and larger community.

Finally, Mr. Traves reported that the provincial government had recently approved and made available funding for NS university libraries to participate in a \$50 mil national site license project. Matching funds were needed for CFI funding. The Province had been lagging, but had now put in their share; ACOA funds were still needed. Perhaps when this project was more mature the University Librarian could give a report to the Senate.

With reference to Mr. Traves' first item, Ms. Ipson complained that sidewalks were being blocked by demolition and construction activity, causing pedestrians to endanger themselves by walking in the street. Could contractors be required to provide safe walkways, recognizing that people will not cross roads to use unobstructed footpaths? Mr. Traves agreed to pass these comments to Facilities Management.

Ms. Kay-Raining Bird referred to the partnership with a private development company and saw some potential problems similar to those arising with the province's P3 schools: how much control would the University retain in the privately constructed residences? Would the University control the level of rents? Who would be responsible for repairs? And what about construction design and materials? Who would be responsible if a bankruptcy occurred?

Mr. Traves undertook to get more information for senators, but commented that the partner company was an award-winning design firm and their proposal met the requirements for residences, day-care centres, and playgrounds. The design was to be consistent with the streetscape.

Mr. Devlin was concerned that rents be kept within reach of students' abilities to pay. How could that be ensured? Mr. Traves explained the company would have to get University approval to rent rooms to any non-student tenants. So any attempt to increase rents beyond the reach of students would leave the building with unrented apartments.

2001:08.

In Camera.

Honorary Degrees

The slate of nominees for honorary degrees to be conferred at the next three convocations was approved.

2001:09.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
APPROVED MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Monday, January 29, 2001, 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, Breckenridge, Brett, Caldwell, Caley, Clairmont, Cochrane, Coffin, Cunningham, Devlin, Downe-Wamboldt, Fraser, Giacomantonio, Guppy, Ipson, Jalilvand, Kay-Raining Bird, Lohmann, B. MacDonald, N. MacDonald, Maes, McIntyre, Pacey, Phillips, Poel, Rowe, Russell, Rutherford, Sastri, Scully, Slonim, Tindall, Traves, Wainwright, Watters, Whyte, Workman.

Regrets: Coté, Emodi, Greatrex, Johnston, Kemp, MacInnis, McGrath, Neves, Starnes, Ugursal.

2001:10.

Adoption of Agenda

Item 8 on the revised agenda became an order of the day for 5:40, and the agenda was **ADOPTED** as **AMENDED**.

2001:11.

Minutes of the January 15, 2001, Meeting

At minute 2001:05, under item (i) "Ms. McIntyre" was changed to "Mr. McGrath"; and at the end of item (ii) the Calendar of Dates, the minutes should read that "the motion was **CARRIED**"; and at page 5, last paragraph, "Mr. Smith" was substituted for "Mr. Maes."

Mr. Wainwright noted that at the end of the discussion of the Amalgamation of the Science Library, in response to comments by the President during that discussion, he had asked that the minutes record that he "objected strongly to the polarized construction of people who responded to the Science Amalgamation as people of reason, on the one hand, and placard-wavers on the other." He requested that the minutes be amended to record his objection. Mr. Traves did not object to the recording of Mr. Wainwright's comment; however, he believed Mr. Wainwright had completely mischaracterized his remarks, and asked that the objection not be specifically pointed in his direction. Ms. Bleasdale thanked Mr. Stuttard for preparing the minutes, and apologized for any confusion resulting from that process. Her recollection was that Mr. Wainwright's objection was a direct response to specific comments made by the President. She trusted that inclusion of the foregoing comments in the minutes of the current meeting would satisfy all concerned.

The minutes were then adopted as **AMENDED**.

2001:12.

Matters Arising

Mr. Scully reported that he had had two conversations with Knowledge House since Senate's last meeting, and at the next meeting he expected to be able to give their response concerning their Website.

As a follow-up to Mr. Emodi's question at the last meeting concerning the effect of academic dates on activities immediately following the Winter Term, Ms. McIntyre reported that there would be no adverse affects for students in the Faculty of Health Professions.

In response to Mr. Devlin's question at the last meeting concerning the new student residence being built and operated by a private contractor, Mr. Traves reported that the University would not set the rental rates for this facility. However, the contract stipulated that the contractor rent only to University students. The University would need to give approval for any unusual rates, and did not anticipate giving that approval if rents were unreasonably raised. The landlord would then be left with unrentable rooms. Mr. Devlin remained concerned that if the landlord raised rents above what students could afford, he would be able to rent to non-students. Ms. Raining-Bird recommended that in future the University secure more stringent control by negotiating a ceiling on rental rates.

2001:13.

Question Period

Mr. Scully alerted Senators to the call later this week for nominations or applications for the position of Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. The Committee had already met twice. The search would be internal.

Mr. Bradfield asked how the approximately \$18,000 for the President's housing and car allowance was distributed. Mr. Traves would secure that information. Mr. Wainwright asked whether Vice-President Scully could provide Senate with a synopsis of his discussions with Knowledge House. Mr. Scully responded that the present delay resulted from the absence of one of the senior officers of Knowledge House responsible for their Website and public relations.

Mr. Whyte suggested that the general tone of Senate discussions might be less likely to deteriorate if a set time for adjournment were adopted. He thought that open-ended meetings became wars of attrition. Mr. Stuttard noted the adjournment time was 6 p.m.; only in unusual circumstances had meetings extended ten or fifteen minutes after that time and only with the agreement of the meeting. Mr. Whyte recommended that in the interests of maintaining a quorum, the adjournment time be strictly adhered to.

2001:14.

Nominations from the Senate Nominating Committee

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

That Senate approve the nomination of Christine Macey (Architecture) to serve on the Senate Academic Appeals Committee.

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

2001:15.

Presentation of the Budget Advisory Committee

Mr. Cunningham introduced those members of BAC in attendance: Mr. Jalilvand, Mr. Scully, Mr. Mason, and Mr. Christie as a resource and support person. In addressing the highlights of the BAC Report XVIII, Mr. Cunningham drew attention to the considerable support system available for students at Dalhousie. One of the Appendices noted that more than \$22 mil was handed out each year to the student body on campus in the form of scholarships, jobs, and burseries. He also noted the significant decline in grants from the government as one of the crucial sources of income for the operating budget; the need to make up this decline through increases in tuition; and the increased commitment of endowments funds towards the costs of running the University. As in previous years, the BAC was encouraging the Board of Governors and the President to work with government in an attempt to increase grants. Finally, Mr. Cunningham pointed out the impact on the University of the dramatic increase in the cost of Bunker C fuel.

At present, the projected budget had a \$2.5 mil shortfall, based on the assumption that the University would secure an approximately 1.5% increase in government grants. Neither tuition nor salary increases had yet been worked into that figure. A 2.5% inflationary increase had been factored in. That was the starting point for the next series of deliberations for BAC.

The Budget contained a recommendation for a \$100,000 allocation to the Registrar's Office for recruitment, and \$700,000 for deferred maintenance, a doubling of the \$350,000 recommended last year. Another item which had struck some people was the increase in the number of faculty, from 841 in the fall of 1997 to 881 in the fall of 1999, an increase of 40 full-time faculty. Finally, the Report attempted to show what happened when the three variables of salary increases, tuition increases, and cuts to the base budgets of each unit came together.

Mr. Wainwright reminded Mr. Cunningham of a meeting which had included himself, Mr. Cunningham, and DFA President, Mr. Faulkner, and asked whether he had any further details and clarification concerning the increase in the faculty positions. Was the Report referring to an uncomplicated 5% increase to complement? Were there complications depending on where within the University the new positions were held? Mr. Cunningham remembered the surprise which had been expressed over the figure 40. Mr. Wainwright also observed the similarities between the running of a University and the running of a home or household. Mr. Cunningham used terms like cost of living increase for the University. That cost of living increase also applied to the students and faculty at Dalhousie, a point which members of BAC needed to find a way to take into consideration.

Mr. Bradfield questioned whether the figures for the change in the absolute value of the government grant were in current dollars. Should the \$9 mil cut in our government grant since 1991 be presented as much higher? Mr. Mason, Vice-President Finance and Administration, agreed.

Concerning the meeting with Mr. Cunningham to which Mr. Wainwright had referred, Mr. Faulkner recalled that the Chair of BAC had undertaken to find out more detail concerning the 40 new positions. Mr. Cunningham had suggested that some of the positions could have been generated by soft money, positions that were not in the complement, and they might have been evenly or unevenly

distributed among the Faculties. He hoped that information would be provided to everyone within the near future. Mr. Faulkner thought perhaps Mr. Wainwright was optimistic when he asked whether this meant there had been a 5% increase in complement. The key questions were how the increase in faculty was distributed, what was the nature of the appointments, and whether they were for research or teaching, or both, and were tenure track or temporary, and funded by hard money or soft money.

Mr. Cunningham would take those questions under advisement, but he pointed out that strictly speaking the BAC was not in the business of accounting for faculty members. He was a little surprised that the Faculty Association itself would not know where the new faculty members were. Mr. Faulkner noted that the administration did usually rely on the Faculty Association for such information.

Ms. MacDonald, Dean of Medicine, pointed out that students in some Faculties did not have the option of being able to work because of the professional component of their programs. At the same time, the professional Faculties had experienced a 15% increase in tuition, while other Faculties had seen much lower tuition increases. However, the amount of money for bursaries had been the same across the Faculties. Ms. MacDonald suggested that the amount of bursary money available to Faculties should be based, differentially, on the level of tuition increase. Indeed, last year that was what her Faculty had thought the BAC was recommending. Ms. MacDonald hoped that this year the BAC would think this issue through carefully. Despite the relatively small amount of money involved, the lack of differential bursaries to offset tuition increases represented real hardship for many students. Ms. Bleasdale suggested that if the Committee was interested in devoting money to recruitment, it might consider the value of announcing their desire to hold the line on tuition fees. That might attract students. Mr. Cunningham noted the need to consider all the variables, not just tuition.

Ms. Binkley noted that two years ago the University had introduced a new fee per class system. The first BAC budget had projected the amount that would be lost because of this new system. She calculated that twice as much had been lost as had been projected. Had any of that lost money been recouped, and was the BAC considering going back to program fees, given that Ontario was now moving to program fees and away from per class fees? Mr. Cunningham did not know whether this was a matter for the BAC to consider. Mr. Mason noted that it had not been the BAC that had recommended the move to fee per class system, so it would not be their responsibility to reconsider it. As for the cost of the change, that was difficult to calculate because there had also been changes in enrolment patterns. The University had not anticipated the extent to which the move to per class fees might cause students to change the way in which they pursued their education. It would take a few years to determine the exact implications.

Mr. Slonim thought the issue of tuition was being underestimated. In one way or another the University would become less and less competitive, at least in the market. He hoped that the University was seriously studying how far tuition could be raised. Halifax was not a rich town; and each time tuition was raised it became a little easier for potential students to choose to go elsewhere. Mr. Slonim hoped the University was not trying to balance the budget on the backs of the students; the result could be bankruptcy if the cost of tuition was pushed too high.

Mr. Wainwright agreed with Mr. Slonim. However, the University also needed to be competitive in terms of attracting and maintaining faculty. Some way had to be found to keep both students and faculty. In this respect, he did not find the BAC's method of presenting budget scenarios helpful. Mr.

Slonim agreed. A simple trade-off was not the way to approach the problems. There was a lack of imagination to find money in different ways. Other universities were using different ways of raising money very effectively. Executive programs were one such way.

Mr. Traves agreed with both Mr. Wainwright and Mr. Slonim. It was unfortunate that the University always found itself having to choose among students, faculty, and quality. In his experience at Dalhousie, the methods of raising funds to which Mr. Slonim had referred had been explored, but when they came before Senate they were a source of contention. On the other hand, there had been a significant increase in the endowment income coming into the University, and many Faculties were bringing in other forms of income.

Mr. Bradfield, noted that every time the BAC had come before the SAPBC in the past several years he had initiated discussion around more flexible use of the endowment funds. The percentage of the endowment funds that were held in bonds might be increased to give more revenue in the form of interest payments rather than in capital gains. This interest would then be available for increased operating expenditures.

Mr. Stuttard thanked the members of the BAC for listening to the feedback and giving it serious consideration.

2001:16.

Proposed Combined MLIS/MPA program

On behalf of the SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

That the proposed MLIS/MPA program within the Faculty of Management be approved.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:17.

Proposed Bachelor of Computer Science Honours program

On behalf of the SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

That the proposed Bachelor of Computer Science Honours program be approved.

Ms. McIntyre obtained confirmation that the name of the degree would have the same form as for all other honours degrees.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:18.

Proposed Master of Applied Computer Science Program

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

That the proposed Master of Applied Computer Science program be approved.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:19.

Revised Guidelines for Centres and Institutes

Mr. Stuttard drew attention to the proposed revisions, dated January 8, 2001, which had been sent out with the agenda. A revised first page, circulated around the table, contained a further revision which SAPBC had been considering and had agreed on by email. The changes included the clarification that one individual could not comprise a centre; a minimum requirement of three faculty members; and provision for an advisory board.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

That the revised Guidelines for Centres and Institutes at Dalhousie be approved.

Mr. Bradfield noted that the date on the Guidelines should read January 29, 2001. Ms. McIntyre suggested a friendly amendment to replace "advisory board" with either "management committee" or "management board." Mr. Stuttard noted that these were minimum guidelines. Management boards might be in place and appropriate for some Centres and Institutes, but he did not think they were a regular feature of Dalhousie Centres and Institutes. Also, advisory boards might not be universal at present, but SAPBC thought they should be a requirement. SAPBC had not discussed management boards.

Mr. Slonim had only just seen the latest suggested change and he thought that if half of the advisory boards members were to be internal, these might in fact nullify the other half. To be realistic, advice was needed from individuals outside the University.

Ms. Guppy asked whether these were generic guidelines that would cover units which were not called either Centres or Institutes. Mr. Stuttard responded that units at Dalhousie which fitted the description should be called Centres or Institutes. SAPBC would be interested in hearing about all such units.

Mr. Traves suggested that if the point of the document was that Centres and Institutes should have advisory boards, that was all that needed to be said. Each Centre and Institute should establish the advisory board that was appropriate to it. Leave the units to evolve as they saw fit. Mr. Traves moved an amendment:

That in the first paragraph of section 1 (Definitions), final sentence, the comma after "advisory board" be changed to a full stop and the remainder of the sentence be deleted.

The amendment was **CARRIED**.

Ms. Binkley recalled that when this document was first drafted, "individuals" and "groups" had been inserted to allow the unit to grow beyond one person's idea or initiative. She favoured retaining "individuals" in the Definitions. Mr. Bradfield noted that a Centre or Institute at Dalhousie carried the

weight of Dalhousie's name, and to have that dependent on one individual was problematic. Also, if someone had a project that was of interest to their department or colleagues it would be easy enough to find two other people to become part of it. To protect the University's credibility, three faculty members did not seem too onerous. Ms. Russell noted that the Health Law Institute had begun with two individuals; however, it would not have been difficult to find others who could have become associated with the Institute. She did not think the three would be a significant obstacle, given that there had to be some strength to build on in the first place.

Ms. MacDonald found section 3.1 quite onerous. Why would the Senate Office want to see annual reports? Mr. Stuttard noted that this was simply record keeping. We had learned by experience that if the Senate Office did not have the record then sometimes the records were very difficult to find. Ms. McIntyre thought there was an academic issue around what was the proper cycle for reviews for Centres and Institutes and what were the documents that should be reviewed. She thought Centres and Institutes were part of regular cyclical reviews. But the requirement of an annual report for Centres which already had their own internal accountability seemed excessive and not in any body's academic interests.

Mr. Stuttard noted that annual reports were very common instruments for most organizations. The report would simply lodge with the Senate Office a record of what had been done during the previous year. There was no review. Frankly, some administrative offices in Dalhousie had great difficulty retrieving records of what had been going on in their units; and Senate Office had been frequently asked to provide the records for a unit where they ought to have had their own records. Ms. MacDonald found it bizarre to request annual reports to Senate on this type of activity, as opposed to all the other types of activities going on in the University. The Departments and Faculties could handle this. Mr. Bradfield pointed out that under (2) the guidelines spelled out that the establishment and operation of Centres and Institutes was the responsibility and jurisdiction of Senate. He also noted the need to update section 3.1 to reflect the current distribution of responsibilities among Vice-Presidents. Ms. MacDonald responded that all Faculties were responsible to Senate, so it would hold that all Faculties should send in all reviews to Senate. Why just go after the little institutes? Mr. Stuttard noted that section 3.1 did not address reviews. Ms. MacDonald observed that the problem was the collection of paper.

Mr. Wainwright clarified that under section 3.1, annual reports were prepared and submitted to the parent academic unit except in the case of an inter-Faculty unit which was asked to supply its report to Senate Office and the relevant Deans. He saw a significant difference between inter-Faculty and intra-Faculty units. Mr. Stuttard noted that there were only three such inter-Faculty units. Mr. Slonim noted that more movement to computers would reduce the problem of losing paper.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:20.

PHS Policy on Misconduct in Science

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

- 1. That the University Policy for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct for U.S. Public Health Service Grant Applicants and Recipients be adopted.**

2. That the existing University Policy on Integrity in Scholarly Activity be amended to recognize the existence of the policy for U.S. PHS grant applicants and recipients.

Mr. Breckenridge, Vice-President Research, drew attention to the briefing he had provided with the documentation for Senate. He noted that Dalhousie had been informed by NIH and the Office of Research Integrity that the existing University Policy did not satisfy their requirements in a number of instances; and they had requested revisions to our Policy in order for Dalhousie faculty members to be eligible for their funding. The current proposal was that the U.S. PHS policy would apply to individuals if there was an allegation of misconduct that related to funding from the NIH.

Ms. Kay Raining-Bird noted that Mr. Breckenridge's covering letter indicated that Dalhousie's Policy did not provide respondents with opportunities to comment on allegations and findings of inquiries and investigations. She did not disagree with having a set of requirements for NIH-funded researchers, but she thought it might be important to consider this for Dalhousie's Policy covering all researchers. Mr. Breckenridge responded that the NIH policy was very specific on many issues which would normally be addressed in Dalhousie's processes, although the University Policy did not describe those processes.

Mr. Bradfield noted that once again a reference in the existing University Policy on integrity in Scholarly Activity to the Vice-President Academic & Research where, presumably, it should be to the Vice-President Research.

Both motions were **CARRIED**.

2001:21.

The Board of Governor's Facilities Renewal Strategy Report: The Exposure Draft

Mr. Stuttard welcomed Mr. Cowan, Chair of the Board of Governors and Chair of the Facilities Renewal Strategy Committee. Mr. Cowan briefly addressed the Report, copies of which had been circulated with the agenda for this meeting. He reminded Senate that the problems confronting Dalhousie in this area were common to private and public institutions throughout North America; and he asked members to consider the Report and its recommendations within both the national and the local context. The University faced a huge problem, and the only solution appeared to be to spend more money. Extrapolating from independent national studies, Dalhousie should be committing five times what it currently spent annually to address the issue of deferred maintenance. Even that expenditure would do nothing toward addressing the backlog of accumulated problems.

The Report's recommendations included the reallocation of some portion of the budget and future budgets to this problem; greater and more effective lobbying of governments; plans for fund-raising for this purpose; even better management of existing resources; maintenance and intensification of the current annual priority-setting process; and sharp delineation of the criteria used in establishing priorities. Pursuit of these recommendations would require both leadership and support from the entire University community. Finally, Mr. Cowan noted the significant steps which had been taken to address Faculties' problems in recent years. The Committee welcomed comments and advice from any member of the University community.

Mr. Devlin thanked Mr. Cowan for the Report, and raised one serious concern. On page four, the Report noted the unmet needs of persons with disabilities; however, addressing those needs was not included among the thirteen recommendations. This was a significant oversight. Dalhousie University was subject to the Nova Scotia Human Rights Code. Also, in three recent decisions the Supreme Court of Canada had aggressively promoted the rights of persons with disabilities. Mr. Devlin suggested that the Committee consider making the issue of disability one of the key and central elements in all priority-setting. Alternatively, or in addition, the University could undertake a disability impact assessment of all projects. Mr. Cowan acknowledged the importance of Mr. Devlin's concerns. Safety and accessibility was one of the titles in the annual statements on the allocation of the A&R expenditures. Mr. Traves agreed with the need to be explicitly sensitive to those with disabilities. The University had existing policies covering these matters, and an annual expenditure from the existing budget went towards long-term enhancement of the campus with respect to accessibility. Accessibility was now also an explicit part of the Facilities Management budget. Following the policy on the duty and obligation to accommodate, Dalhousie had in the past taken immediate and aggressive action to accommodate students with disabilities. The most recent example was in the Faculty of Architecture, where expenditures over two years had made the building accessible to a wheel chair-bound student.

Mr. Slonim hoped that the government would be contributing to this area. Mr. Traves noted that the provincial government traditionally supported new projects, but the Presidents of the Nova Scotia Universities had been urging the provincial government to transform its capital fund into a maintenance fund. At the national level, Presidents were also pressing for action.

Ms. McIntyre thanked Mr. Cowan and the Committee for their excellent work. She noted that sometimes a new building was the cheapest way to address problems with facilities renewal, and wondered to what extent the Committee had explored the question of new buildings. For example, the report referred to space for the Faculty of Health Professions as deplorable, but as yet the Faculty had not made it to any list for new buildings. Ms. McIntyre also asked for Mr. Cowan's thoughts on the issue of financing for emergencies or catastrophes such as the recent need to replace the chiller.

Mr. Traves noted that the mandate of the Committee had been drawn very narrowly, such that it had excluded explicit consideration of new buildings. On the matter of deficit financing, a subcommittee had explored options, but the issue always revolved around the question of long-term planning for repayment of any loans. Mr. Cowan added that the Committee understood the need for new buildings, even though that was not addressed in their Report.

Mr. Wainwright understood the distinction being made between new buildings and old facilities, but in his poetic flight of fancy little way he liked to think of facilities renewal broadly, as including the rejuvenation generated by being accommodated adequately. In this respect, he noted that recommendation 11 called for establishment of a University policy "governing the limited conditions under which more than one office can be assigned to a faculty or staff member." He supported the recommendation, but asked the Committee to consider a companion recommendation that a policy be established governing the limited conditions under which an office can be assigned to faculty or staff members. The adequacy of office space was a critical consideration in the construction of new facilities. Mr. Wainwright appreciated that the new FASS building would be clean and new, but the office space for many faculty would be cut in half when they moved into the new building. The reduced space meant that personal book collections could not be accommodated. For those in the humanities and social sciences, office space and personal academic libraries were the equivalent of

research laboratories and were crucial to research and to working with graduate students in particular. Mr. Wainwright hoped the University would remember this for the future.

2001:22.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.