

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

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for November 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, November 26, 2001, at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, MacDonald Building.

Present with Mr. M. El-Hawary in the chair were the following:

Ben-Abdallah, Binkley, Bleasdale, Bowie, Bradfield, Breckenridge, Brett, Caldwell, Caley, Cochrane, Coffin, Corke, Coughlan, Egan, Elder, Emodi, Fraser, Galarneau, Guppy, Gupta, Guy, Hart, Harvey, Huebert, Jalilvand, Kwak, B. MacDonald, McGrath, Mobbs, Moore, Murphy, Neumann, Neves, O'Mara, Poel, Rajora, Rowe, Sastri, Savoy, Schroeder, Scott, Scully, Slonim, Sommerfeld, Starnes, Tindall, Tracey, Traves, Ugursal, Watters.

Invitee: K. Crombie, Brian Crocker

Regrets: Alexander, Cunningham, MacInnis, Maes, McIntyre, Phillips, Powell, Saunders, Schwarz, Whyte.

2001:133.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

2001:134.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

At item 2001:125, para 4 was deleted and the following was inserted: "Mr. Bradfield commented that he believed that part of the problem was that two classrooms, A&A 218 and 234, each of which accommodated 150 students, had been converted to office space. The Senate Physical Planning Committee had objected to this net loss of classrooms of this size, but had been reassured that the Deans had been contacted and had not objected because they could simply double up sections and place them in the large auditoria in the new FASS building." The minutes of the meeting of October 29, 2001, were then adopted as **AMENDED**.

2001:135.

Matters Arising

Elaborating on his requested amendment to the minutes of the previous meeting, Mr. Bradfield

noted that the SPPC had been told that the Deans had been consulted on the conversion of the two classrooms in the A&A; however, the April 2001 minutes of the meeting of the Faculty of Science indicated that the Deans had not been consulted in a timely fashion: "Dean Kimmins outlined the events concerning the closing of excellent classrooms in the A&A Building which were to be converted to office space. This move was presented to the Faculty as a fait accompli." Ms. Binkley, Dean of FASS, added that she had not been consulted in a timely fashion either; and she had not that sections could be doubled up. She suggested Mr. Bradfield take this matter back to SPPC.

Ms. Bowie reminded members of her concerns expressed at the last meeting that lack of seating was forcing students to sit on the floor in some classes. Mr. Traves had requested specific information on this problem. Since that meeting, Ms. Bowie had consulted with the DSU, the Dalhousie Science Society, and the Dalhousie Arts and Social Sciences Society. With feedback from only a small sampling of students, she had compiled a list of nine classes in which seating appeared to be a problem. She thought a broader sampling of students would reveal a broader problem. Ms. Bowie moved:

That the issue of class size be addressed at the first meeting of Senate following the Christmas break.

Ms. Guppy thought that concerns surrounding class size should be dealt with before the beginning of the next term, and she moved an amendment:

That "the December 10, 2001, meeting of Senate" be substituted for "at the first meeting of Senate following the Christmas break."

The amendment **CARRIED**.

Mr. Traves suggested it would be a courtesy to submit the information to the Registrar's Office and to those responsible for class scheduling, as he had requested, rather than present it at Senate where no one had the detailed background information with which to respond. Ms. Bowie agreed to provide the President with her list of the relevant classes. The President and Mr. El-Hawary undertook to invite the Registrar to the next Senate meeting. In response to a question from Mr. Ugursal, the Chair gave it as his understanding that the next meeting would consider potential methods of addressing any perceived problems surrounding the present method of allocating classrooms.

Mr. El-Hawary reminded members that the motion as amended read:

That the issue of class size be addressed at the December 10, 2001, meeting of Senate.

The motion as amended was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Slonim asked that his vote against the motion be recorded.

2001:136.

Question Period

In Mr. Traves' email concerning the most recent *Maclean's* survey results, Mr. Scott had been struck by Dalhousie's ranking in two areas in particular: the University had ranked thirtieth in the percentage of total operating budget allocated to libraries; and thirty-ninth in the percentage of total operating budget allocated to student services. Mr. Scott thought that overall the survey showed that Dalhousie had slid significantly during the past few years.

Mr. Traves thought the recent survey reflected on-going and long-standing issues. He was not in a position to express full confidence in the information submitted by all Universities concerning their budget allocations. Statistics and categories were arbitrary and comparisons might not be accurate. Methodological questions aside, the survey had to be interpreted as a reflection of the balancing of Dalhousie's priorities over time. Many demands and pressures on the University's budget and resources had forced the University to make difficult decisions. But this was not a new phenomenon. The President believed our relative position had remained unchanged for the past three years. In the area of library expenditures, Dalhousie's situation was complicated by its participation in an interprovincial interlibrary loan system, NovaNet, a variable in determining library expenditures. Suggestions that the NovaNet data be accepted and used by the *Maclean's* survey had been rejected. That said, Mr. Traves agreed there were problems with the amount the University was able to invest in both library resources and student services.

Mr. McGrath noted that in campus tours for potential students, the issue of class size, particularly at the first-year level, consistently arose. That did not seem to be in the long-term interests of the University. Were there plans to attempt to reverse the apparent trend towards streamlining teaching resources and increasing class sizes? Mr. Scully noted that the University lacked a plan to address this problem at both the Faculty and the central administration level. Class size had been shaped over time by Faculty practices and priorities. The issue would need to be addressed if Dalhousie was going to grow. In part this was a regional issue; but if the University wished to be compared with other institutions on a national level, and to attract students from across the country, some group needed to address this and related problems. Mr. Scully thought this issue might be raised under the Enrolment Management Report.

In response to Mr. Bradfield's question concerning the number of Canada Research Chairs taken up since July 1, 2001, Mr. Scully noted that information concerning the Chairs had been circulated recently to Deans, Directors and Chairs. A website containing this type of information would be operating in the near future. In the meantime, Mr. Bradfield might check with his Chair or Dean. Mr. Traves added that the allocated Chairs as yet unfilled were not a problem, as some individuals had suggested. From his perspective the only problem was that the University had not found the right candidate, and this reflected a position aspect of the allocation process – the thorough vetting of candidates by their peers.

Mr. El-Hawary noted that Question Period had consumed only ten minutes.

2001:137.

Nominations to Senate Committees

Mr. El-Hawary welcomed Ms. Waters who was representing the Senate Nominating Committee. Ms. Waters presented the nominations for Senate Committees, and on behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

That the following nominations be approved:

To the Senate Steering Committee, David Tindall (Science) November 2001-June 30, 2003;

To the Senate Academic Priorities & Budget Committee, Hans-Gunther Schwarz (FASS) November 2001-June 30, 2003;

To the Senate Discipline Committee, Mary-Lou Ellerton (Health Professions) November 2001-June 2004;

To the Honorary Degrees Committee, Jack Novack (Henson) November 2001-June 30, 2003.

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

2001:138.

Nomination to the Panel of Student-Discipline Officers

Ms. Bleasdale moved:

That on the recommendation of the Acting Dean of the Faculty of Law, Mr. William Lahey be appointed to serve on the Panel of Student Discipline Officers for the term January 1, 2001 to August 31 2002.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:139.

Proposed Bachelor of Arts with a Minor in Law and Society

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

That the proposal for a Bachelor of Arts degree with a Minor in Law and Society be approved.

Mr. Brett noted that the proposed Minor would allow students pursuing a Bachelor of Arts degree to receive credit for law-related classes. The students would be required to take at least

one half class in History, Political Science, Philosophy, and Sociology and Social Anthropology. The program would operate with existing resources. Opening up the program to include other Faculties would probably be contingent on additional faculty resources, given that the classes involved were currently close to or at their maximum enrolments.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:140.

Enrolment of King's Students in the Bachelor of Music Program

Mr. El-Hawary drew members' attention to the information concerning this item which had been circulated with the agenda. SAPBC had considered and given its support to the proposal to enroll Kings's students in the Bachelor of Music program. No action on this item was required by Senate.

2001:141.

Modification to the Master of Public Administration & Related Programs

Mr. El-Hawary drew members' attention to the information concerning this item which had been circulated with the agenda. SAPBC had reviewed and supported the modification to the Master of Public Administration and related programs (MLIS/MPA and LLB/MPA). No action on this item was required by Senate.

2001:142.

Enrolment Planning & Management Report

At Mr. Scully's suggestion, the meeting agreed to consider this item at the next meeting of Senate. Mr. Bradfield wondered why the Enrolment Planning & Management Report had been given to the Board of Governors *in camera*. Mr. Traves explained that the Board had adopted a policy of considering a range of strategic issues in a context which enabled members to speak freely. Some of these issues, such as plans for enrolment and recruiting, involved competition with other institutions. Mr. Scully added that the paper copy presented to the Board was identical to the copy which Senators would be considering.

2001:143.

Faculty Election Procedures for Senate

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

That the Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate be amended at page3, under A, Elected Faculty Members, paragraph 3, to read: "Faculty elections to Senate shall occur in February of each year for the term beginning in July of the same year."

Mr. El-Hawary reminded members that a motion to amend the Senate Constitution required the support of two-thirds of members present and voting. An abstention was not a vote.

Ms. Binkley noted that since its inception in 1988, FASS had been unable to provide its full slate of elected Senators by the March deadline. The numerous changes in faculty members' plans from February through July meant the current March deadline was unrealistic. Moving the deadline ahead would only compound the Faculty's difficulty in securing elected representatives, and she would vote against the proposed amendment.

In response to Mr. Scully's question, Mr. El-Hawary explained that the time between the election of Senators and the beginning of July was currently insufficient to allow the Nominating Committee to fill the positions of Senate Officers and on Senate Committees. Ms. Bleasdale recognized that a number of Faculties had trouble meeting the March deadline for election of Senators. That struck her as an excellent reason to move the deadline ahead to February. If Faculties set their sights on February, they might be able to secure at least the majority of their elected Senators by the end of March. The Nominating Committee could then begin reviewing who would be eligible to serve in what capacity. Faculties unable to elect all of their Senators by February would have the same leeway they had had in the past to submit their additional representatives after the deadline.

Mr. El-Hawary reminded members that a motion to amend the Senate Constitution required the support of two-thirds of members present and voting. An abstention was not a vote.

The motion was **LOST**.

2001.144.

Draft Conflict of Interest Policy

The Chair presented the Steering Committee's recommendation that Senate devote an hour of one meeting to the presentation and discussion of the proposed Policy, and continue that discussion at its next meeting. That would enable Senators to formulate proposed changes and amendments to the Policy, then make recommendation to the Board of Governors. Members agreed with the proposed course of action.

Mr. El-Hawary welcomed the University Legal Counsel and Secretary, Mr. Brian Crocker, and the Associate Legal Counsel, Ms. Karen Crombie. He invited them to introduce the Policy.

Mr. Crocker began a brief overview of the and the issues it raised. The Policy was an attempt to ensure that decisions and actions of University members, made on behalf of the University, were in the best interests of the University. Those best interests were not always clear, and the Policy did not attempt to spell them out. However, the Policy attempted to manage conflicts of interest within the University. It recognized that members of the University community were increasingly involved in activities which raised the possibility of conflicts between University interests and personal interests.

Mr. Crocker reminded members that within the University numerous and potentially conflicting interests existed at any one time. The fact that members might find themselves in a conflict of interest did not suggest wrong-doing, but reflected the variety and complexity of their activities

and relationships. Because the University was increasingly called on by the larger community to account for decisions and actions taken on its behalf, it needed to ensure that these conflicts were managed appropriately. The proposed Policy through which this would be done was not complex. Mr. Crocker trusted members would find the definitions set out in sections 2 and 3 helpful. Some were unavoidably unclear, such as the definition of “personal interests”. But he thought the proposed Policy as a whole would provide guidance as to when a conflict existed between personal interests and the interests of the University. Other definitions, such as that for “university member” at 3.7, demonstrated the broad reach of the Policy to cover not simply employees of all types, but any individual acting on University committees or making decisions on behalf of the University. The definition of “closely associated individuals” broadened the context in which the Policy operated even further by including not only relatives of University members but anyone with whom a member had an intimate personal relationship.

Mr. Crocker noted that the inclusion of intimate personal relationships raised the controversial issue of inappropriate relationships between teachers and students; and Policy drafters had had to consider whether the University wished to enforce an outright prohibition on teacher-student intimate relationships. The Policy discouraged that type of relationship, but recognized that in some circumstances instruction of a student by an intimate might be unavoidable, such as when a spouse was the only individual teaching a required class. In such instances, the Policy would assist the administrative head to manage the situation by establishing appropriate means for independent adjudication of the student’s work. In other circumstances, however, the Policy made it clear that a teacher and student involved in an intimate relationship were leaving themselves open for complaints under the Sexual Harassment Policy.

Ms. Crombie explained that the process for dealing with conflicts of interest aimed at ensuring fairness for all parties, those declaring a conflict, those affected by a conflict, and the University as a whole. To ensure that the Policy also operated as efficiently and as non-intrusively as possible, the process had been divided into three parts: recognition, disclosure, and resolution. The first part involved recognition that a decision-maker, or person closely associated with that decision-maker, had, or might be perceived to have, an interest which would inappropriately influence the outcome of a decision being made in the interests of the University. Under the proposed Policy, disclosure would be made to the individual’s administrative head, in the case of faculty members and those working in academic units, their Dean. In the resolution stage, the Dean would decide what was in the best interests of the University: whether the situation could continue, and if so, under what conditions; or whether the individual should withdraw as a decision-maker. All decisions would be made in writing, and all decisions could be appealed to the Dean’s administrative head. Decisions would be kept in a central location and an annual would include a summary of decisions and any recommendations for changes to the Policy.

Mr. Crocker spoke to 5.3, the procedures set out as guides to dealing with six specific types of situation. These included personal interest in contracts; personal interest in the outcome of assessment; teacher-student relationships involving family, business or intimate personal relationships; personal interest in research projects; student involvement in research involving a personal interest; and employment decisions concerning family members or intimates. If and when other types of situations emerged, appropriate processes would be applied, and the Policy would be amended accordingly. In general, the processes involved the need for recognition and

disclosure, then management of the situation. Minor corrections to the text included addition of a coma and deletion of the reference to an attachment in the final sentence of section 4.

Ms. Crombie reminded members that the proposed Policy was not a prohibition of certain activities, but an attempt to ensure that anyone questioning a decision taken on behalf of the University could be confident that appropriate procedures were in place to manage conflicts of interests. Ms. Crombie and Mr. Crocker welcomed questions.

Speaking for a moment as a literary critic, Mr. Hubert saw the two themes motivating the document as money and sex. The proposed Policy could be an important means of managing these human motivations. But he wondered about what appeared to be a hopeful neutrality underlying the assumption that the monetary cases and the sexual cases could be dealt with in the same way. Could they? Personally, he had little difficulty with the idea of complete financial disclosure, but he thought his colleagues might share his concerns about full disclosure of sexual involvements should questions of inappropriate conduct arise. Mr. Hubert also saw financial disclosure as more objective.

Mr. Crocker noted that the issue of intimate personal relationships was seldom discussed on campus, except with a wink, or in the context sexual harassment. The proposed Policy required disclosure of a personal interest involving an intimate personal relationship; but it did not require exposure of the details of such a relationship. He trusted that would allay the concerns of those involved in such relationships. He added that in most cases financial disclosure would not require detailed reporting, thought that would be determined on a case by case basis.

Mr. Ugursal raised three questions. Firstly, could a mechanism be put in place to minimize the disparities which would result from different Deans reaching different conclusions in similar cases? Secondly, was there a time limit within which the administrative head had to take action on the disclosure of a conflict of interest? Some matters concerning conflicts of interest would be time sensitive, and failure to act quickly could open the University to problems. Thirdly, would placing the decision-making in the hands of the administrative heads result in an increase in grievances, given the impact that conflict of interest situations could have on the employment of a faculty member in the University? The breadth of the Policy provided considerable scope for disputes concerning a member's academic freedom, for example? Could the process be made more transparent in order to minimize the unpleasant aftermath and the cost of grievances and arbitrations?

Mr. Crocker thought three processes set out in the Policy would work in favour of consistency across Faculties. The annual review which involved the Senate and the Board of Governors in looking at the decisions would help to ensure some consistency. The ability of members to appeal their Dean's decisions, if they knew them to be out of line with decisions being made by other Deans, would also tend towards consistency. In addition, decisions would be forwarded to the office of the University Legal Counsel, which would assist in establishing guidelines for decision-making. Ms. Crombie added that further guidelines would be provided once the Policy was passed.

Concerning time limits, Mr. Crocker believed the Policy implied that decisions were to be made

as quickly as possible, but the consultation required by the Policy, and variations in the time required for consultation in different cases, would make strict time limits unworkable. The use of Deans as decision-makers, rather than a University-wide hearing panel, was an attempt to ensure cases were dealt with promptly. Also, the Policy required that all appeals be handled expeditiously.

Mr. Crocker accepted that some decisions taken under this Policy might result in grievances. However, he did not see anything in the proposed Policy that was contrary to the existing Collective Agreements. Grievance which arose would be dealt with appropriately; and in some instances the Collective Agreement might prevail. But that would not affect the Conflict of Interest Policy. He was unclear about the relationship Mr. Ugursal was drawing between the Policy and issues of academic freedom. In general, Mr. Crocker did not see a conflict between rights set out in the Collective Agreements and the proposed Policy. Ms. Crombie noted that a major challenge in creating the Policy had been the broad employment base of the University, and the need to include those outside the academic units.

Mr. McGrath appreciated that in most instances administrative heads would mediate conflicts in the best interests of individual members and of the University community. But the Policy was vague as to what could or would be done were an administrative head to act inappropriately. He appreciated that there was an appeal process; however, the section of the document dealing with appeals, as well as the accompanying chart, left questions as to who would ultimately be responsible for ensuring that decisions were fair to all concerned. Mr. Crocker agreed that there would not be what might be called a Policy "czar". But he thought the appeals process and the annual review of all decisions would protect against arbitrary and unfair decisions. Ms. Crombie noted that the concept of mediation was misleading. It suggested that there were competing rights. The Policy was not concerned with adjudicating rights. It was a blueprint for managing relationships and guiding behaviour.

Mr. Slonim asked about relationships involving third parties, such as industry. What would happen in instances in which the Policy required an individual to disclose information covered under a confidentiality agreement with a third party? Would the University assume the liability for resulting litigation? Those involved with industry in developing technology might find themselves trapped in situations similar to the case at M.I.T. Mr. Crocker thought that in cases such as that involving Dr. Olivieri at the University of Toronto conflict of interest was not an issue. Such cases posed important questions about whether members of the University should be signing confidentiality agreements and undertaking secret research, but he saw that as a separate issue. The University did have insurance which covered members for actions undertaken as part of their work. But there was no one simple answer as to whether members would be protected under Dalhousie's insurance policy or by lawyers hired on the University.

Mr. Poel asked for clarification of 5.3.5, student involvement in research involving a personal interest. Did the Policy intend to include all group research contexts in which the faculty member was the investigator working with students who were simultaneously attempting to complete their program of study in a timely fashion? Did this, and other questions such as those concerning authorship of papers, fall within the jurisdiction of Graduate Studies or the Policy or both? In general, Mr. Crocker expected the Policy would require the reporting and adjudication

of a wide range of relationships between professors and students. Mr. Traves noted that in his time the former Dean of Graduate Studies, Mr. Ricketts, had attempted to draw up rules and regulations which would protect students' interests in their relationships with professors. Some Universities had in place a contract which professor and student signed at the beginning of their relationship. That type of agreement could protect all parties against expensive litigation concerning issues such as intellectual property rights.

Mr. Hubert wondered how the University would deal with situations in which an individual did not recognize or disclose a conflict of interest. Ms. Crombie noted that 5.1 put the onus on members of the University to report any undisclosed conflict of interest in which they had reasonable grounds to believe another member might be involved. As set out in section 8, failure to comply with the requirements for disclosure constituted grounds for disciplinary action. Mr. Crocker added that this was not out of line with the Collective Agreement between the Board and the DFA which allowed for discipline with just cause. This underlined the importance of educating the University community about the need to disclose possible conflicts of interest.

Mr. McGrath returned to the hierarchical structure of the decision-making process and to the question of jurisdiction. To use the Memorandum of Understanding between Dalhousie and Knowledge House Inc. as an example, had the signing of the Memorandum been perceived as involving a conflict of interest, which body would have been responsible for resolving that, the Senate or the Board? Debate over the agreement had suggested that the Senate would have reached different conclusions than the Board about what was in the best interests of the University. Ms. Crombie responded that the administrative head of the President and the Vice-Presidents was an ad hoc committee consisting of the Chair of the Board, the Chair of the Board's Operations Committee, and the Chair of the Audit Committee.

Mr. Traves thought it was important to distinguish between two issues here. Were the President to sign a contract with a company in which he held shares, he would have to disclose a conflict of interest. On the other hand, conflicting ideas as to whether a course of action was good for the University was a difference of opinion, not a conflict of interest.

Mr. Tracey was concerned about the potentially confusing overlap between the proposed Policy and the Board's Conflict of Interest Policy. Since the President and the Vice-President sat on the Board of Governors, how was the distinction to be drawn between decisions made while engaged in Board-related activities and those that would fall under the greater University interest which the proposed Policy was intended to address? Mr. Crocker noted that the Board's Policy, which had been established in 1988, dealt with meetings of the Board or its committees. It stipulated that anyone who was in a conflict of interest had to declare that conflict and withdraw from the discussion and voting on the matter. Any Board member of a Senate committee who had a conflict of interest would be governed by the procedures set out in the proposed Policy. Mr. Tracey suggested that section 11 clarify this.

Ms. Bleasdale indicated that Steering Committee members had been silent during the discussion because they wished to hear what other Senators thought of the proposed Policy. But those who had read the Steering minutes knew that the Committee had raised concerns about the Policy, and after four meetings, the majority of Steering members had still expressed reservations about

important aspects of the Policy. That suggested it should not be rushed through. One concern shared by some Steering members was that the Policy adopted a business model for what was a public institution. Ms. Bleasdale suspected this concern would be shared by many in the broader University community, though they had not yet had an opportunity to be heard. As a public institution Dalhousie had a responsibility to be more sensitive to concerns such as those raised by Mr. Slonim, and to the type of issues which might bring us into conflict with the community outside the University, such as the case at the University of Toronto, mentioned by Mr. Crocker. She did not think those issues could be neatly separated out from internal conflicts of interest in the same way that companies could attempt to separate them out.

Mr. Tindall wondered about the compatibility between the Board's document and the proposed Policy. Mr. Crocker had raised the possibility of a Board member serving as a member of a Senate committee, and the definition of a University member was at the bottom of page 3 seemed to include Board members. But Board members did not appear to have an administrative head to whom to report a conflict. Mr. Crocker agreed that needed to be considered. Mr. Tindall received clarification that the Board's policy extended to all meetings of the Board and its committees. He remained concerned that one document referred to one subset of people, the other document referred to another subset of people, and the two subsets overlapped. In cases in which the two documents were potentially applicable, which would apply? Mr. Crocker thought the clarification in section 11 suggested by Mr. Tracey would address any confusion. With the exception of meetings of the Board and its committees, the proposed Policy would apply.

Mr. Emodi remained troubled by the issue raised by Mr. Slonim: the responsibility of an administrative head to disclose a conflict of interest to a third party. This was not clearly stated in the Policy. Mr. Crocker understood the concern, but he thought disclosure to the third party would be necessary. As cases were dealt with under the Policy, more detailed guidelines would be developed. Mr. El-Hawary asked whether it would be best to deal with further guidelines in their totality. Mr. Crocker doubted that all potential problem areas could be anticipated. Cases could be reviewed annually with a view to periodic recommendations for improving the Policy.

Mr. Traves reiterated that conflicts of interest did not imply wrong-doing. The primary concern was to develop regulations which could protect individuals from unintentional but inappropriate behaviour. Much of the Policy might appear self-evident, but in other areas the definition and resolution of conflicts of interest was far from clear. He did not think what was being proposed was a business model. Ideas of conflict of interest were imbedded in all human relationships. The fact that many organizations had adopted the approach advocated here reflected a growing appreciation of the need to regulate behaviour in this area. The fact that Dalhousie had managed without a formal policy, and had avoided cases such as those at the University of Toronto and M.I.T. was largely a matter of luck. This Policy would provide the necessary protect against such cases in the future.

Mr. El-Hawary thanked Mr. Crocker and Ms. Crombie and invited them to attend the continuation of the discussion at the December meeting of Senate.

2001:145.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.