

Item: Senate Minutes, October 1997

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 1997. 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 Thursday, 9 October 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. C. Stuttard in the chair were: Apostle, Archibald, Bleasdale, Boychuk, Bradfield, Cameron, Camfield, Connolly, Crocker, Egan, Emodi, Farmer, Furrow, Gantar, Guppy, Gupta, Iskandar, Kimmins, Lacey, Lee, MacDonald, MacInnis, Maloney, McIntyre, Moore, Morehouse, Myers, Oore, Patriquin, Powell, Rathwell, Ricketts, Ross, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Shafai, Shepherd, Sutherland (representing Ryall), Taylor, Tindall, Tomblin-Murphy, Ugursal, White.

Regrets: Bell, Binkley, Coffin, Cunningham, Hartzman, Hooper, Hyndman, Kipouros, Morrissey, Rhodes, Robertson, Scassa, Siddiq, Traves, Vohra, Wrixon.

Mr. Stuttard drew members' attention to the just released Security Bulletin which announced that all pieces of the Dalhousie china had been recovered in excellent condition, through the Nova Scotia Crime Stoppers Association. The announcement met with applause.

97:138.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard asked to add as item 5 of the agenda a brief report from the Steering Committee. The subsequent items were renumbered accordingly, and the agenda was adopted as amended.

97:139.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

At item 97:131, paragraph 2, last sentence, "2.1.2" was changed to "7.1", and "Presidential Review Committee" became "University Librarian Review/Search Committee." At page 5, paragraph 4, line 1, "Mr. Carmichael" became "Mr. Wallace"; and the minutes of 22 September, 1997 were adopted as amended.

97:140.

Awarding of Degrees and Diplomas

College of Arts and Science

Mr. Taylor proposed that degrees and diplomas be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Arts.....	110
(Distinction 3, Honours 12, First Class Honours 5, Adv.Major 20)	
Bachelor of Arts Advanced Major Conversion	3
Bachelor of Arts Honours Conversion.....	5
(Honours 5)	
Bachelor of Education	2
Bachelor of Science	66
(Distinction 6, Honours 4, First Class Honours 2, Adv.Major 16)	
Bachelor of Science Advanced Major Conversion.....	4
Bachelor of Science Honours Conversion	1
(Honours 1)	
Diploma in Engineering.....	9
	TOTAL 200

DalTech

On behalf of the Principal, Acting President, Mr. Kimmins, proposed that degrees be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Environmental Design Studies.....	42
Bachelor of Engineering	5
Bachelor of Computer Science	3
	TOTAL 50

Faculty of Graduate Studies

Mr. Ricketts proposed that degrees and diplomas be awarded as follows:

Doctor of Philosophy	31
Master of Arts	55
Master of Science *.....	47
(*5 of these are in Agriculture & 3 of the students to convocate at NSAC Convocation)	
Master of Nursing	4
Master of Social Work.....	15
Master of Environmental Studies	8
Master of Business Administration.....	15
Master of Education.....	2
Master of Health Services Administration.....	2
Master of Laws	8
Master of Development Economics.....	6
Master of Library and Information Studies	3
Master of Marine Management.....	22

Master of Public Administration.....	1
Graduate Diploma in Public Administration	1
Master of Arts in Teaching (French)	1
	TOTAL 221

DalTech Graduate Degrees

Mr. Ricketts proposed that degrees be awarded as follows:

Master of Computer Science.....	4
Master of Architecture (1 st Professional).....	11
Master of Architecture (Post Professional).....	1
Master of Urban and Regional Planning.....	5
Master of Applied Science.....	12
Master of Science.....	3
Master of Engineering	1
Doctor of Philosophy	3
	TOTAL 40

Faculty of Health Professions

Ms. McIntyre proposed that degrees and diplomas be awarded as follows:

B.Sc. (Health Education)	4
Bachelor of Science (Kinesiology).....	3
(Distinction 1)	
Bachelor of Science (Kinesiology) - Honours.....	1
Bachelor of Recreation	1
Bachelor of Physical Education.....	1
Diploma in Outpost and Community Health Nursing	7
Bachelor of Science (Nursing).....	17
(2 Basic stream; 15 Post RN)	
Bachelor of Science (Physiotherapy).....	1
Diploma in Health Services Administration.....	4
Bachelor of Social Work.....	8
(Distinction 2)	
	TOTAL 47

Faculty of Law

Ms. Russell proposed that degrees be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Laws	5
------------------------	---

Faculty of Management

Mr. Rosson proposed that degrees be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Commerce11

Mr. Taylor moved (seconded by Ms. Russell):

That Senate approve the awarding of degrees and diplomas to the candidates identified in correspondence to the Secretary.

The motion **CARRIED**.

Mr. Rosson moved (seconded by Ms. McIntyre):

That the appropriate Dean or the Provost of the College of Arts and Science or Principal of DalTech and the Registrar, in consultation with the Chair of Senate, be authorized to add to and remove from the graduation list the names of any students omitted from or included in the list through demonstrable errors on the part of the University or one of its officers, or for other reasons, and that any such additions or deletions be reported to Senate.

The motion **CARRIED**.

97:141.

University Governance Document - Notice of Motion from Faculty of Arts and Science

Mr. Stuttard drew members' attention to the Notice of Motion from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences which had been included on the agenda for today's meeting. Mr. Ugursal moved (seconded by Mr. Patriquin):

That the previous motion of September 22, 1997, to adopt the University Governance Document (dated September 11, 1997) as amended and excluding section 2 be rescinded.

Ms. Furrow, an elected member from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, spoke against the motion. She considered it undesirable to overturn at one Senate meeting a decision of the previous meeting, particularly when that decision had been reached after considerable thought and discussion. As a member of the Committee which had been set up to draft the Governance Document, Ms. Furrow also believed the Document had had a good hearing by the three faculty members and the three representatives of the Board of Governors who had comprised that Committee. The document had been duly considered by the Steering Committee, and then by Senate. Mr. Cameron thought that the motion should not have been placed before Senate, and asked the Chair of Senate why he had not ruled it out of order. Mr. Stuttard explained that it was possible under Robert's Rules of Order for a body such as Senate to consider at a subsequent

meeting a motion to rescind a previous motion. It was not a motion to reconsider; such motions may be moved only by someone who had voted in favour of the successful motion, and must be moved during the same meeting. Mr. Cameron stated he was also a member of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and, like Ms. Furrow, he would be voting against the motion. He had attended the Senate meeting at which the Document had been carefully considered, though he had not attended the Faculty meeting from which this motion had arisen.

Mr. Crocker thought Senate would require an extraordinary reason to rescind a motion which it had already adopted. He had not heard such a reason. Mr. Ugursal explained that he had moved the motion because he had read the memo from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, which indicated that the motion had carried unanimously. He believed that it should be the duty of Senate to follow the expressed will of the people. If one of the largest Faculties at Dalhousie requested that Senate rescind a previous decision, we should take such a request very seriously. As one of the very few members of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences who had attended the meeting which had produced this motion, Ms. Higgins, a non-Senator, urged members to take into consideration the fact that there had been no notice to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences that the motion would be brought forward, and that consequently she believed the Faculty had erred in voting on the motion. In addition, the meeting had continued past the usual termination time, and many members had been obliged to return to their classrooms, and had been unable to vote on the motion.

Mr. Bradfield believed that the question of consultation was important. Having representation on a Committee which met and then reported back to Senate with a finished report did not constitute adequate consultation. Further, Mr. Bradfield believed that at the last meeting of Senate the process of consultation had been cut off, as indicated at the top of page 6 of the minutes, when the President had urged members to pass the Document because of the number of searches which needed to get underway immediately. He understood that the Committee which had prepared this Document had completed their work some months previous. If haste was required, why had the Document not been presented to Senate several months ago? This struck Mr. Bradfield as another example of the too numerous instances in which Senate had been asked to approve items for reasons of expediency, and had then had reason to regret acting in haste. The present motion allowed Senate to take more time to consider an important Document, and avoid future regrets. As a member of the Committee which had drafted the document, Mr. Stuttard explained that the President had circulated the first draft to all Deans. All the Vice-Presidents had also seen that initial draft.

As a matter of information, Mr. Taylor advised Senators that within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences the quorum was ten members. At the Faculty meeting of September 23rd, of the twenty-five members listed as attending, more than ten but less than twenty-five had been able to stay for consideration of the motion. Currently the Faculty had approximately 125 full-time faculty and a number of sessionals, bringing the total membership to roughly 150. Mr. Lee wished to note that, in moving the motion to adopt the bulk of the Governance Document at the September 22nd Senate meeting, he had not been bamboozled by the President, or anyone else. He had heard nothing at this meeting which would lead him to vote in favour of rescinding.

The question was called and the motion was **LOST**.

97:142.

Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Stuttard reported that, in light of the Senate discussion of September 22nd, the University Governance Document had been slightly edited to improve clarity and incorporate the few changes approved by Senate, especially 1.3.2, Nominations, and 1.3.10, Authority of President. The section on the Associate Principal of DalTech was still in preparation; some revisions to Section 2, the Appointment of the President, were now ready. A document containing approved and unapproved sections would be discussed at the Statutory Joint Meeting of Senate and the Board of Governors, the "6 and 6", scheduled for October 20th. Mr. Stuttard hoped to bring back to Senate for approval in November the unapproved sections. He believed that the version brought to Senate in November would be consistent with the concerns expressed by Senate, including the concerns of those who had voted against approval of the Document.

For information, Mr. Stuttard noted that another topic for discussion at "6 and 6" was the Strategic Directions document. He trusted members were considering the document and forwarding their critiques to the Chair of Senate and/or the President. In the Steering Committee meeting of September 11th, Mr. Traves had made a commitment to forward copies of feedback he received to the Chair of Senate. That feedback would be made available to the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee for discussion. SAPBC had already had one discussion of the Strategic Directions document.

97:143.

Report of the President

In the absence of President Traves, there was no report from the President.

97:144.

Question Period

Mr. Bradfield asked whether the name of DalTech had been officially confirmed. Mr. Stuttard responded there would be nothing official until January, and the designation "DalTech" could still be used. Mr. Bradfield also asked to see a Report on the Capital Fund Campaign. He had heard that \$45 million had been raised. SPPC had been advised that there was a strict limit of \$12 million for the new Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Building. He, and others, would be interested to know what would happen to the other \$33 million raised in the campaign. Finally, he inquired about the recently announced 1% largesse to be distributed in November. Would all members receive the same lump sum, or would the lump sum be prorated in some way for the years of suffering endured? Or was it going to be based on an individual's salary as of this year,

so that anyone employed on October 29th could collect his/her 1%? Mr. Stuttard explained that Mr. Mason had broken the news during the SAPBC meeting of October 6th. His understanding was that the amount was 1% of salary rate for eligible employees, and that anyone who had signed on this month was eligible.

Mr. Archibald asked if Mr. Mason had indicated he had taken advice as to whether this was an appropriate course of action under the Trade Union Act. Mr. Stuttard responded that SAPBC had not raised that question. It would be a bonus paid in November, after the restraint legislation would have expired. The Officers of the Board had met on Friday, October 3rd to reach this decision. Mr. Kimmins added that the Board had consulted with their legal advisor about the appropriateness and correctness of allocating the money in this manner to salaries. The answer had been that it was consistent with the Act. Also, Vice-President Mason and Mr. Kimmins had met with the Presidents of each of the Bargaining Units on Monday morning of October 6th, to brief them and answer any questions. Mr. Tindall requested clarification on two points. Firstly, had Mr. Mason said it would be 1% of salary rate, which would mean that a half-time person would receive a full-time amount? Mr. Stuttard confirmed that Mr. Mason had said salary rate. Secondly, Mr. Tindall asked Mr. Kimmins to clarify whether he had meant that the legal advice received by the Board had been that this payment was consistent with the Trade Union Act of Nova Scotia. Mr. Kimmins indicated that the legal advice concerning consistency with the Trade Union Act had been sought because of the understanding that the wage restraint legislation ceased at the end of October.

Mr. Stuttard requested and received permission to return briefly to the Report from the Steering Committee. He explained that the approved portion of the University Governance Document, 3.1, Appointment Procedure for Vice-President (Academic/Research), stated that the Review/Search Committee for the Vice-President (Academic/Research) shall have at least three representatives from Senate, one of whom shall be a Dean. At the President's suggestion, the Steering Committee had agreed that the number of Senate representatives should be five, one of whom shall be a Dean, all appointed by Senate. In response to a question from Mr. Lacey, Mr. Stuttard clarified that the Committee would include either an undergraduate or a graduate student. Mr. Archibald explained that the Steering Committee was not suggesting a change to the Governance Document, but was proposing a specific number of members for one Committee that was larger than the minimum prescribed in the document.

On behalf of the Steering Committee Mr. Stuttard moved:

That Senate approve a Review/Search Committee for the Vice-President (Academic/Research) comprising five members appointed by Senate, one of whom shall be a Dean; one member appointed by the Board of Governors; one undergraduate or graduate student; and the President (ex-officio Chair).

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Stuttard noted Steering had no suggestion for changing the number of representatives on the Search Committee for the University Librarian. The number of representatives of Senate on this Committee was four. In November the Steering Committee would bring to Senate nominees for

Senate representatives for the Search Committee for the Vice-President (Academic/Research), and the Search Committee for the University Librarian.

Returning to Question Period, Mr. Bradfield requested that the Report from SPPC which had been distributed at the last Senate meeting be placed on the agenda of the next Senate meeting. Mr. Stuttard agreed to include the item on the agenda of the October 27th meeting.

97:145.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Minutes approved.

Secretary

Chair

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
APPROVED MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Monday, 27 October 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Adams, Apostle, Archibald, Bell, Binkley, Bleasdale, Bradfield, Cameron, Camfield, Connolly, Crocker, Cunningham, Farmer, Fooladi, Furrow, Gantar, Guppy, Gupta, Hooper, Hyndman, Kay-Raining Bird, Kimmins, Kipouros, Lacey, MacDonald, MacInnis, Maloney, McIntyre, Moore, Myers, Patriquin, H. Powell, Rathwell, Robertson, Ross, Rosson, Scassa, Shepherd, Siddiq, Slonim, Taylor, Tindall, Tomblin Murphy, Traves, Ugursal, Wallace, White, Wrixon.

Invitees: G. Curri, J. Eastman.

Regrets: Coffin, Egan, Iskandar, Lee, Morehouse, Phillips, C. Powell, Ricketts, Ryall, Russell, Shafai.

97:146.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

97:147.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 9 October, 1997 were adopted as circulated.

97:148.

Addition of Name to List of Fall Graduands

Mr. Stuttard reported that with the authority granted at the 9 October, 1997 meeting of Senate, at the request of Mr. Tom Emodi, Acting Dean of Architecture, and after consultation with the Registrar and the Chair of Senate, the following name had been added to the graduation list for the Fall of 1997:

Bachelor of Environmental Design Studies

Kristen Marie Welton

97:149.

Nominations to Senate Committees

Mr. Stuttard noted that the University Committee on the Environment was in the process of considering changes to its terms of reference, specifically the provisions for Committee membership; and he requested that Senate defer consideration of additional members for that Committee until its review had been completed. On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Ms. Guppy moved:

That Senate approve the following nominations: Donald Langille (Medicine), 1997-2000, to the Senate Committee on Academic Administration; William Phillips (Elected Senator), Senate Term, to the Senate Physical Planning Committee; and David Patriquin (Science), 1997-2000, to the Ombudsperson Advisory Committee.

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

97:150.

Nominations to the Vice-President (Academic & Research) Search Committee

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

That Senate appoint the following individuals to serve on the Search Committee for the Vice-President (Academic & Research): Anne Higgins (Arts & Social Sciences/English); William MacInnis (Dean of Dentistry); Colin Stuttard (Chair of Senate/Science); Judith Ritchie (Health Professions/Nursing); Chris Watts (DalTech/Agricultural Engineering).

In response to Mr. Stuttard's first call for further nominations, Mr. Siddiq moved the nomination of Mr. Dale Poel (School of Public Administration) to the Search Committee for the Vice-President (Academic & Research).

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared nominations closed. Mr. Stuttard reminded members that, in light of the additional nominee, the "Procedures for Elections" required that an election for members of the Vice-President (Academic & Research) Search Committee be held at the next regular meeting of Senate, 10 November, 1997.

97:151.

Nominations to the University Librarian Search Committee

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

That Senate appoint the following individuals to serve on the Search Committee for the University Librarian: Elaine Boychuk (Acting University Librarian); Wai-Choong Foong (Dentistry/Member of SLC & SCITPC); Graham Morgan (Chair, SLC); Helen Powell (DalTech Librarian/Member of Senate).

In response to Mr. Stuttard's first call for further nominations, Mr. MacDonald nominated Judith Reade (Faculty of Management/School of Resource and Environmental Studies); Mr. Tindall nominated Karen Smith (Killam Library); and Ms. Furrow nominated Jane Archibald (Killam Library). After the requisite three calls for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared nominations closed.

Ms. Binkley asked for clarification as to what other members were appointed to or elected to these Committees from other constituencies. Mr. Stuttard clarified that the Search Committee for the Vice-President (Research & Academic) also included a member of the Board of Governors and a student, with the President acting as Chair. The Search Committee for the University Librarian included three additional members appointed by the President, a student, and a representative of the Librarians. The Acting Vice-President (Academic & Research) would chair the Committee. Ms. Binkley asked whether we knew the identities of those appointed by the President to the Search Committee for the University Librarian. Mr. Traves indicated that one individual would be an elected staff member from the staff group. He would choose the other appointees after the rest of the slate had been determined, in an effort to ensure a reasonable balance.

Mr. Stuttard again reminded members that the "Procedures for Elections" required that an election for the University Librarian Search Committee be held at the next regular meeting of Senate, 10 November, 1997.

97:152.

Senate Physical Planning Committee Report

Referring to the Report of SPPC, dated 15 September, 1997, Mr. Bradfield began his comments by reminding members of the requirement that any new buildings be considered by a joint committee of the Senate and Board, and that a recommendation subsequently be made to the Board. He wished to raise concerns expressed by members of the Senate Committee over the availability of funds to construct the proposed DalTech Building. Firstly, the \$1 million a year which would be received from 1999 to 2006 had to be

discounted to the construction completion date, December 1999. Consequently, we would not be working with \$7 million, but with some fraction of \$7 million, that fraction would depend on the interest rate used to calculate the discount, an issue addressed in the Report. Members also needed to remember to factor in the annual operating costs of the new building, an issue addressed in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Report. These operating costs would also represent a deduction from the flow of funds from the provincial government. A subsequent meeting of the Board had also considered the issue that the \$1 million per year was not designated solely for accommodation, but was also intended to help fund programing expenses in Computer Science. This would further reduce the amount of money available for building costs.

Together, these issues raised the larger question of how much money had to be raised in addition to the provincial funds. Mr. Bradfield reminded members that such questions were crucial since in their Financial Strategy Report of 1990 the Board of Governors had set down the principle that new building construction should not begin until the funding for the project had been actually committed. An additional question not in the Report, but one which would be coming up, was where the building should be sited.

97:153.

School of Health & Human Performance

On behalf of SCAA, Mr. Stuttard moved three motions concerning the School of Health & Human Performance:

That the name of the Bachelor of Recreation degree be changed to Bachelor of Science (Recreation).

That the length of the Bachelor of Science (Recreation) program be changed from 3 years to 4 years, effective September 1998.

That the proposal for a 4-year Bachelor of Science (Recreation) with a Minor in Business be approved.

Mr. Maloney, Director of the School of Health and Human Performance, explained that these motions were the result of considerable planning within the School over the last three years. This planning had been a response to changes in the external community, and in part an adjustment to the rationalization decisions of the Government of Nova Scotia which had resulted in the loss of the teacher preparation programs in physical education and health education. A comprehensive package of curriculum change proposals had been accepted by the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Health Professions, and forwarded to SCAA, which had approved the motions now before Senate.

Senate had already approved a new name for the School, based on its revised mission statement. Other changes in keeping with the new mission statement would include the creation of a set of core courses which would require adjustments in all degree programs. In all these programs, the School believed course changes would enhance and enrich the current study streams. The most significant changes were to be made in the Recreation degree program, as reflected in the motions forwarded by SCAA. The change to a 4-year program would allow for incorporation of the core courses and the strengthening of the School's offerings in the major study streams, Therapeutic Recreation and Administrative Management aspects of Recreation. Development of the 5-year double degree integrated program in Recreation and in Management had been slower than anticipated; and as a result the proposal here was for a 4-year degree with a Minor in Business. The proposed structure was consistent with other such programs in existence at Dalhousie.

Mr. Sutherland, representing the Acting Dean of Science, was impressed by the work which had gone into the proposal, but regretted this further use of the designation Bachelor of Science for an area that was not associated with the Faculty of Science. He noted, in particular, that the third recommendation called for 30 credit hours in Business classes, but only 15 credit hours in Science. Ms. McIntyre responded that all other undergraduate degrees in the Faculty of Health Professions were now called Bachelor of Science. If this motion passed, all degrees at the undergraduate level would properly be designated Bachelor of Science, in keeping with the concept that basic Sciences were an important base for all Health Sciences, including the Therapeutic Recreation and Recreation Management streams. Mr. Maloney reiterated that this program had been developed using the template taken directly out of the Calendar, and had been modeled after other programs with Business components.

Members agreed to vote separately on the proposed motions.

The motion to change the name of the Bachelor of Recreation was **CARRIED**.

The motion to change the length of the Bachelor of Science (Recreation) was **CARRIED**.

The motion to approve a Bachelor of Science (Recreation) with a Minor in Business was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Stuttard asked, and received, permission to defer discussion of the proposed change to the Bachelor of Music until Mr. Kemp had arrived, and the meeting proceeded to the motion on Parchment Language.

97:154.

Parchment Language

On behalf of SCAA, Mr. Stuttard moved:

That the language used on all parchments issued after 1997 be changed from Latin to English.

Ms. Furrow asked whether this motion was asking us to give blanket approval to the change to English, and whether members would get a chance to discuss and review the wording on the parchments. Mr. Stuttard assured her they would.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

97:155.

Bachelor of Music Program

On behalf of SCAA, Mr. Stuttard moved:

That the proposal for a Bachelor of Music (Instruction) program be approved.

Mr. Stuttard drew members attention to the agreement reached at the meeting of SCAA to change the proposed name of this program from a Bachelor of Music (Classroom Instruction) to a Bachelor of Music (Instruction). Mr. Taylor explained that this proposal arose in part out of the closure of the Bachelor of Education (Music) program, but was in fact a different program, designed to be offered entirely within the Music Department, and students would receive a Bachelor of Music degree. Students could choose to go on to do a Bachelor of Education degree, but the Bachelor of Music (Instruction) would give them other options involving instruction in Music. The proposal entailed no new costs because it utilized existing staff and facilities. As the minutes from SCAA indicated, other universities in Nova Scotia with Music programs had already adopted, or were in the process of adopting, similar programs. This proposal would complement the areas already existing in Performance, Composition, and History.

Mr. Taylor asked Senate whether it could accommodate a request from the Music Department to further modify the name change to Bachelor of Music (Instructional Music). This was preferable from the Department's point of view. Mr. Kemp reiterated that all the Music Schools in the Maritimes had had to cope with this need for change from the integrated degrees in Music. This was an opportunity to broaden the experience of students in various areas of pedagogy. Discussions with Acadia had helped to define a program which presented common goals and aspirations, so that a student applying to a College of Education would have some common background. Asked to comment on the Music Department's request for a further modification of the title for the degree, Mr. Kemp believed the Department would be satisfied with the name Bachelor of Music (Instruction) provided the students understood what was meant by "Instruction".

The motion was **CARRIED**.

97:156.

Report of the President

Mr. Traves was pleased to once again congratulate the graduates of the University. The recent Convocation had been a welcome opportunity to jointly offer Dalhousie and TUNS degrees, since, under the aegis of the Amalgamation Agreement, students had been able to choose to graduate with TUNS degrees. The President was also pleased with the number of faculty members who had turned out to share with graduates and their parents this important occasion.

The President went on to summarize the key features and advantages of BANNER. He reminded members that we had decided last year to purchase a new computer system which would allow us to better serve the University community. BANNER could deliver five components: a fully integrated student information system; a new financial system; a new human resources system; a new system for alumni and development; and a Web for students. The first component, the student information system, needed to be in place as quickly as possible to accommodate admissions for the fall of 1998, otherwise we would begin running into the "year 2000" problem. Other elements would be introduced less quickly. The entire system would give us a comprehensive and integrated system so that material could be entered only once, and then moved throughout the system. This would eliminate the cost of repetitive data entry, and help to minimize errors. BANNER would also give us the opportunity to ask about improving the service levels and flexibility of our administrative processes, and allow us to think through basic questions about how we administer our institution. A process involving changes of this magnitude would inevitably be trying for any organization. The President encouraged members to be patient with the amount of work required, and to be open-minded and ready to make the necessary compromises any change of this magnitude would require.

The project Steering Committee would communicate regularly with the University community. The community would be fully informed about the issues and the difficulties confronted, and given the opportunity to debate important matters. The President distributed two documents, one an overview of the aspects of the system, the other an introduction to the project and an attempt to answer some questions.

Mr. Traves then addressed the Canadian Foundation for Innovation, introduced recently by the federal government with an \$800 million dollar budget to be allocated over the next five years. The government was in the process of creating the organizational capacity which would enable the CFI to fund the research infrastructure across the country. Most of the money would go to universities. This initiative would require us to think about our internal priorities. Given the straitened circumstances under which many of us had lived for years, a major challenge would be to think grandly. There would be two elements to the approval process for each proposal. Proposals would be considered on their academic merits, and proposers would need to demonstrate how their specific demands were linked to the academic purpose of the project, and the breadth of linkages to other interests in the University. In this, we would be in competition with strong proposals from other universities or networks of universities. There would be no provincial quota, no Dalhousie quota, and no guarantee that any university would receive funding.

The second component of the CFI was the provision that the Foundation would only match funds. In most cases it would provide 40% of the funding of the project costs, and in some exceptional cases 50%. A major question and problem facing us was how we would secure private sector contributions. A number of provinces had already agreed to put up provincial money, and the President had been lobbying for the government of Nova Scotia to put money on the table. Recently the provincial Minister of Education and Culture had indicated a willingness to put up a sum approaching \$15 million as a first installment. This would generate \$10 million for an approved project.

Given the understanding that only universities with a strong research profile would be likely to succeed, and given Dalhousie's strong research profile across the board, we were the likely major beneficiary within the province. There was also a special provision under the CFI arrangements which guaranteed the small undergraduate universities a minor allocation, since they would not be in competition for the major funding. The other universities in Nova Scotia had already been informed by the CFI that they fitted under this second category of funding recipients. This gave Dalhousie an excellent opportunity to benefit from the CFI, but we would need to craft proposals and continue our lobbying. The President believed the province had made a strong 3-year commitment; we needed to continue our lobbying to keep open another 2-year commitment. Mr. Fournier was heading up a group to consider proposals, and Senators were encouraged to spread the word

amongst their colleagues, and contact Mr. Fournier with any questions concerning proposals. The President understood that the University would have to approve and rank each proposal.

Also on the issue of funding, the NSCHE was considering further options concerning the funding formula. In the endless process of submissions to the government and lobbying on this matter, Dalhousie continued to argue for a formula more sensitive to Dalhousie's distinctive needs. This would remain a major challenge, as we attempted to argue against the perception of many that Dalhousie was the rich university which should relinquish funds to the other institutions.

Finally, and also in relation to financial matters, the President believed we had seen a breakthrough in the area of assistance to students, and greater recognition of the debt problem and the need for changes in the variety of student aid arrangements. What would be done remained unclear; however, the issue was reaching the top of political agendas. Mr. Traves was now the Chair of an AUCC Committee on Student Aid; and he promised the university presidents would continue their representations on this matter.

Mr. Ugursal was concerned about the possibility that the TA's might go on strike, particularly in light of the fact that Dalhousie paid its TA's at a rate only slightly higher than that offered by MacDonald's. Mr. Traves responded that negotiations with CUPE had been conducted for an extended period of time, but that that was not unusual in a first contract which required all issues be addressed. While he was not on top of all the issues, he understood that most of the non-financial differences had been resolved. A Conciliator had been appointed in the summer; the University had participated in conciliation; and CUPE had decided not to continue the process, and were now in a position to poll their members to determine whether they wished to strike or continue negotiating. The President asked members to see this issue in the context of all the other issues facing the University. In his experience at this University, all financial claims had a logic and merit; but the University had to balance conflicting claims for limited resources. Also, in his experience, few groups ever came forward to offer to give up their interests to benefit other interests. But he saw no reason why we could not come to an agreement. A strike did not seem imminent.

On the matter of BANNER, Mr. Bell asked whether an individual had been appointed to oversee such a colossal undertaking. Mr. Traves responded that the University had contracted with a large consulting firm which would identify what needed to be done and what type of person would be most suitable to head the operation. Mr. Cameron noted that, following an earlier presentation of the BANNER, he had consulted with other colleagues and found them astonished by the suggestion that full classes would be eliminated. Was it the case that the University would not be able to offer full year courses once BANNER was in place? Mr. Traves responded that this was one of the issues which we needed to address, hopefully in greater detail in a comprehensive presentation at later meetings, first at SCAA and then in Senate. Having just completed changes for the 1998/99 Calendar, Ms. Binkley wondered whether the changes necessitated by BANNER would need to be in place by January, and require immediate reworking of the Calendar.

Mr. Kimmins explained that the components of BANNER would be implemented sequentially, with a rolling introduction such that SIS would begin with the recruitment of students in the Fall of 1998. The first group of students to be under BANNER would be those registered for classes in September 1999. Thus there were no adjustments needed for the 98/99 Calendar. In response to Mr. Ugursal's question about the cost of BANNER, Mr. Traves gave a ballpark figure of approximately \$2 million dollars. He explained that Dalhousie had attempted to build its own system a few years ago, and when that had not worked out attempts had been made to buy a system off the rack. Of the two that were available, one had not appeared suitable for Dalhousie's needs, and would have represented a downgrading of our present system. BANNER became the choice by default; but a recent independent review had indicated that it was, in fact, the system of choice for organizations such as Dalhousie. The President asked the Officers of Senate whether they could make available the earlier minutes of the meeting when this matter had been brought to Senate.

97:157.

Question Period

Before beginning Question Period, Mr. Stuttard welcomed to the meeting the new Dean of the Faculty of

Computer Science, Mr. Slonim.

Mr. Bradfield returned to his question of a previous meeting, the handling of the credit card scam of some months ago. The **Gazette** had investigated this issue further and had been told by the Vice-President Finance that there were only two cases. Mr. Bradfield had personally known of three cases, and the student paper had subsequently uncovered eight cases in one Department. He remained concerned that the Administration's investigation may not have been adequate. The eight cases in one Department suggested that someone may have been opening pay check stubs, a cause for considerable concern. Given the information gathered by the student paper, was the Administration investigating their systems further? Mr. Traves understood that a thorough investigation of this issue had identified a significant number of potential sources for this information, and the University had no capacity to isolate the source. The Administration had discussed the matter with the Police, and the Police had discussed it with the credit card company. Mr. Traves understood that a number of faculty members had been seriously embarrassed. But in a legal sense this appeared to be a problem for the credit card company, and the company was dealing with the Police.

Mr. Cameron agreed with the President's response. The biggest problem appeared to be with the Police, who considered this a case of fraud not against the individual but against the credit card company. He did, however, take issue with the statement by the Police and quoted in the Gazette to the effect that they had no information. It had been their studied practice to refuse to receive information, on the grounds that the matter was beyond their jurisdiction. Personally, Mr. Cameron had had several meetings with Security and Mr. Mason on this issue, and he felt the University had been as helpful as it could be.

97:158.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Minutes approved.

Secretary

Chair