

Item: Senate Minutes, January 2007
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for January 2007. 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 22, 2007, at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Mo El-Hawary in the chair were the following: Binkley, Bodorik, Butler, Chowdhury, Cleave, Cochrane, Cook, Croll, Dunphy (Recording Secretary), Edelstein, El-Masry, Fraser, Grundy, Haslam, Helland, Hicks, Jones, Kesselring, Klein, LoRusso, Maes, McNeil, Moukdad, Mukhida, Pegg, Pelzer, Persaud, Poulton, Saunders, Scherkoske, Schroeder, Scrimger, Shaver, Simmonds, Singleton, Slonim, Smith, Spence Wach, Sullivan, Sutow, Swanston, Taylor, Tindall, Traves, Wallace, Wanzel, Watters, Wheeler, Whyte.

Regrets: Adshade, Allen, Breckenridge, Camfield, Geldenhuys, Lane, McConnell, Webster.

Absent: Barker, Gray, Hubert, Johnson, Khimji, Leon, McLarney, Nowakowski, Plug, Precious, Rutherford, Sheng, Tipping, Yeung.

Invitees: B. Broudreau, A. Power

The Chair welcomed Senators to the first Senate meeting of 2007 and he thanked Mr. Butler for assuming the duties of Chair of Senate while he was away and recovering. Mr. El-Hawary also expressed his thanks for the competence of the members of the Faculty of Medicine, who attended to his care and for this he said he will always be grateful and asked Mr. Cook to convey this sentiment to his faculty colleagues at the appropriate time. He expressed thanks to Senators and Senate staff for the good wishes that he received while he was away.

2007:01

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was **ADOPTED** as circulated.

2007:02

Draft Minutes of December 11, 2006 Meeting

2.1 Approval

The minutes if the meeting of December 11, 2006 were **ADOPTED** as circulated.

2.2 Matters Arising

Mr. Dunphy provided an update on the Senate Discipline Committee Working Group and advised that there has been a sequence of meetings with different groups of people, but the group is not ready to give any substantive information and it is anticipated that within the next few Senate meetings information will be forthcoming. Mr. Whyte asked how many student cases were waiting to be heard from the end of the last semester before Christmas to this one. Mr. Dunphy said that he could not give an exact figure, but that he thought that between six to eight cases waited with some of those being because the students had chosen not to have a hearing when it was offered because they were going to be away. Some of those cases were because faculty members were not available for a hearing. There were no further matters arising.

2007:03

Question Period

There were no questions.

2007:04

Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee:

- a. New Program Proposal: Combined Honours in Statistics and Oceanography
- b. New Program Proposal: Combined Honours in Physics and Oceanography
- c. New Program Proposal: Combined Honours in Mathematics and Oceanography

Professor Bernard Boudreau, Head, Department of Oceanography, was invited to speak to the proposal. Copies of the January 15, 2007 SAPBC *draft* excerpt pertaining to the proposed programs were available at the meeting.

On behalf of the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED:**

THAT Senate approve the new program proposals for a Combined Honours degree in Statistics and Oceanography, Combined Honours in Physics and Oceanography, and Combined Honours in Mathematics and Oceanography.

Mr. Boudreau explained that these programs were submitted in a continuing effort to be more involved in undergraduate education. A few years ago Senate approved the Honours with Biology, Earth Sciences, and Chemistry. Senate is now being asked to have programs with the remaining departments where it makes sense to have Combined Honours degrees. Mr. Boudreau said they are already advising students in these departments, particularly with Physics. This formally recognizes the existence of this advising, and it also gives a new program for undergraduates to get involved with Oceanography at the Honours level.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2007:05

Senate Nominating Committee: Senate Standing Committee Member Vote

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED:**

THAT Ms. Louise Carbert, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, be nominated to the Senate Academic Appeals Committee for the term February 1, 2007 – June 30, 2009; and

THAT Ms. Roberta Barker, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, be nominated to the Senate Discipline Committee for the term February 1, 2007 – June 30, 2009.

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the nominees were declared elected to their respective committees.

2007:06

Senate Steering Committee: Senate Nominating Committee Member Vote

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

THAT Ms. Dawn Russell, Faculty of Law, be nominated to the Senate Nominating Committee for the term February 1, 2007 to August 31, 2008.

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, and hearing none, the nominee was declared elected to the Senate Nominating Committee.

2007:07

Board of Governors - Long Term Financial Planning Committee Report

Mr. Traves presented the Board of Governors - Long Term Financial Planning Committee Report. Mr. Traves' PowerPoint presentation can be found at http://senate.dal.ca/Files/presentations/2006_LTFPC_Nov_28.ppt. Following the presentation of the PowerPoint Mr. El-Hawary thanked Mr. Traves for his presentation and invited questions from Senators.

Mr. Pegg read a letter (appended to the minutes) from the Faculty of Engineering titled, Faculty of Engineering Response to the Board of Governors Report of the Long Term Financial Planning Committee. Mr. Traves responded briefly by saying that he does not think the Board suggested that we should “destroy” the associated University system and thinks the Board have expressed a concern related to the associated university system and the costs for Engineering education at Dalhousie University. The Board is recommending that we work diligently to resolve the anomalous situation that we face, which is that we attract far fewer students into first and second year programs in comparison to the number of students that we educate in our third and fourth year programs. This is truly anomalous and is not the case in any other major Engineering schools in the country. In an environment where investment follows student numbers, it is important to change the number of students that we have. There are a variety of mechanisms to do that and Mr. Traves has spoken with the Dean of Engineering in this regard.

With respect to the cost allocation questions and some of the issues that Mr. Pegg spoke to, Mr. Traves pointed out that, in the Report, it is indicated that the cost allocation at the University is a fairly rough one as we have a host of direct costs we can attribute to faculties. At every university in Canada there tends to be a surplus produced from faculties that teach large numbers of undergraduates in fairly large classes. Some faculties that are equipment or lab intensive have different kinds of student/faculty ratios, different kinds of graduate teaching arrangements etc. tend to be more expensive. Inevitably, there is some degree of cross-subsidization between faculties. This is the way all universities in the country are run, and in fact, even within faculties there are cross subsidies between some departments and others. The Board was trying to suggest that we eliminate this, but they are mindful of the fact that there are burdens placed on some parts of the institution, as they sustain other parts of the institution and to the extent that we can mitigate those strains for the benefit of those who require additional support. This will in turn liberate some resources for other parts of the University as well. Mr. Traves noted that Mr. Pegg's observations were helpful and he will pass the comments along to the Board when it comes time to consider the recommendations.

Mr. Whyte indicated that he was interested in the long-term funded debt. He was curious to know how much might be anticipated to be used to rescue the physical plant and how much would be anticipated to fund the new development of an attractive environment for our students. Can this be included in the report? Mr. Traves stated that the University does not have any long-term unfunded debt and the Board could be open to the notion of long-term debt, but only if it is funded. Consequently, a great deal of work has to go into this area. We have made proposals to the provincial government that they enter into a partnership with the University in which we would put some of our resources together with some new resources that they might provide. In turn we would use these resources to create a cash flow that would allow us to finance a long-term debt. We would then take those funds and turn them back into the University, principally to improve our physical plant. In most cases, because we have a long-term deferred maintenance problem, we would turn a lot of those expenditures into things that are not visible to most, but which all would benefit from; the heating and ventilation systems, electrical systems, the deterioration of buildings. Most of the funds that we would secure would go in that direction, and there are a number of buildings on campus in significant need of this kind of attention. There are, however, some areas where we know the cost of renovation might well exceed the cost of replacement, and in such cases we would look at other solutions.

Another recommendation in the Board's analysis that deserves comment and which speaks to some of Mr. Whyte's concerns is that the Board has suggested a good physical infrastructure practice. We know that approximately 2% of the value of a building should be put into a fund which would go to renew the building over time. Dalhousie has an estimated physical plant worth slightly in excess of \$1.1 billion. Consequently, we should be spending approximately \$22 million a year on campus renewal. Five years ago we were spending \$2 million a year. Currently, we are spending about \$7 million a year because we have made a concerted effort to invest substantially in this area. The Board recommends that we continue this process of increased investment by essentially transferring approximately \$1 million a year into the physical renewal fund until we hit that point where we have something close to 2% of the value of our assets invested in this area. This is a long term plan. In the event that we are able to secure a very favorable loan, we would be in a position to catch up to some of the long-term costs that we have built up.

Mr. Slonim indicated that one major concern he had with the current changes that the University is reporting is how the University is expected to achieve these changes. Mr. Traves indicated that this is a good question and indicated that Mr. Slonim is right to underline this point. This goes back to a very self-conscious decision that the Board made around the respective responsibilities in the University between the Board acting, essentially, as financial trustees, and Senate, and through Senate, faculties and academic departments acting on their responsibilities with respect to the academic programs of the University. Mr. Traves noted the silence is very self-conscious and very appropriate and is an issue that this body and other academic units within the University need to grapple with as we go forward. Mr. El-Hawary commented that this would be an excellent subject for the next Senate forum.

Ms. Spence Wach asked about faculty/staff ratios. First, did the Committee know whether or not the faculty/staff ratio has shifted to the better or the worse over a period of time, or was it a snap shot in time? Secondly, when assessing faculty to student ratios, Ms. Spence Wach wondered about the extent to which the recruitment of staff was figured into the way that we look at overall faculty and staff in relation to students, and not just faculty and student ratios, because that is again another significant cost element. Mr. Traves responded by saying that the Board did look at long-term trends. What is striking is, despite the fact our enrolments went up by 25-30% over a five-year period we were busily hiring more faculty and staff because we knew that we had some long-term issues that needed some catch-up. We also have an organizational cultural bias in the University that every time we receive extra funds, we use it to hire someone, rather than spending it on a variety of other things. So, in fact, there have been changes, but the changes are in the framework. Dalhousie University's 14-1 faculty/student ratio compares to other universities which are closer to 20-1. There is a consequence to that kind of approach in terms of the shape of the university. The picture has not changed dramatically, and this is one area where there will be a review of the structure of academic programs and staffing levels, and a long-term plan will be derived. This could be a three to five-year process before we begin to even see any serious changes, and these changes will not be incredible. We do not have to move a lot. If Dalhousie University moved from 14-1 to 16-1, that would have big implications for us in terms of the amount of resources that we have available for all sorts of things that we want to do.

Mr. Klein asked the Chair of Senate whether the letter he wrote to the President in December 2006 could be distributed to Senate. Mr. Traves indicated his approval and Mr. Klein's email letter is appended to the minutes. Mr. Klein stated that he was very appreciative of the huge amount of effort that the committee put into the Report and he thinks it very important for the University to be thinking about our future, which is one of the goals of that report. In that light, he also wanted to mention, considering the dire circumstances we were in 1990, and the much rosier circumstances we are in now, that we must have been doing something right over all those years, despite the fact that many of the statistics that the President mentioned haven't changed that much. Mr. Klein commented on the balance between high and low cost, which he takes to be graduate and professional versus undergraduate. It would appear to Mr. Klein that we are not discussing about reducing the professional numbers, but about increasing the undergraduate component, and he would like to be sure that is exactly what the Board thinks. Mr. Klein quoted from the report: "that the University set a target for graduate enrolment which better balances Dalhousie's traditional strengths in post-graduate

education with a proportionate size of graduate enrolments at comparable universities.” Noting that particular sentence does not seem to follow what the President said, which was that the Board is not imagining reducing graduate and professional enrolments. The President clarified that it is not the Board’s intention to reduce graduate enrolments.

Mr. Traves responded by saying that the assumption that graduate and professional equals expensive and low costs equals undergraduate is broadly correct. First, there are some graduate programs that are relatively low cost and are essentially course based. Others are higher cost, and we understand that because they are more faculty-intensive. You have a faculty member supervising a Ph.D. student. On the other hand, we know that in the Department of Music at the undergraduate level, we have one on one instruction for students who are studying a particular instrument. So again, the characterization between low cost, high cost, and graduate versus undergraduate is not quite accurate, and it is important to appreciate that as we move forward. All that said, he thinks the Board’s fundamental understanding and preference would be to see us ‘grow’ our way out of the problem. In fact, over the last few years, while we grew rapidly, we didn’t change the ratios because we were growing as rapidly at the graduate level as we were at the undergraduate level. That is something that we wanted to do for all sorts of reasons related to our research activities, but it is something that we need to be much more aware of. As Dalhousie University is not a profit-maximizing institution we want to optimize the mix of programs to ensure we balance our budget. If we do this, we have fundamentally addressed our mission.

Mr. Klein agreed with the President’s approach and thinks Senate would agree as well, but in the recommendation that he quoted from, the word “graduate enrolment” was used. That was not his interpretation of high cost, but what was actually said. He thinks it important that if what was meant was “we will try to increase undergraduate enrolment”, that maybe graduate enrolment targets should not be highlighted, and, secondly, it is going to be quite difficult to maintain our graduate enrolment that we have now in light of the fact that the larger provinces seem to be doubling the numbers of graduate students. Mr. Traves said that this may be a situation that from an unfortunate perspective solves itself. However, but if it solves itself by our graduate enrolments dropping radically; he would not look upon that as a good solution. In this context, the Board has pushed that we need a graduate scholarship program in this province that is the equivalent of graduate scholarship programs in other provinces. This is because we need to be more competitive in our capacity to attract high-quality graduate students from this region to this University, and obviously from other parts of the world as well. As the Board adopts this Report, they will look to the President and through him to the Vice-Presidents and the Deans, and through them, to all of our colleagues at the University to implement this as appropriate for the academic future of the University.

Mr. El-Hawary thanked the President and all Senators who had participated in the vigorous discussion of the Board of Governors - Long Term Financial Planning Committee Report.

2007:08

In Camera - Amendment to the Dalhousie University list of Graduands, May 2006 Convocation

The assembly moved in camera to consider and receive for information the amended Dalhousie University graduands list for May 2006.

2007:09

In Camera - Senate Honorary Degree Committee -Voting on Honorary Degree Candidates, Spring and Fall 2007

The assembly continued in camera to consider and vote on five honorary degree candidates following which the assembly returned to open session.

2007:10

Chair's Report

Mr. El-Hawary reported that the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee received the Senate Review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on January 15, 2007 and the Report is available for review in the Senate Office. Mr. El-Hawary reported he has received notification that the following program proposals have received MPHEC approval: Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Arts Honours in Music, and Bachelor of Community Building and Design.

2007:11

President's Report

Mr. Traves invited Senators who have any further thoughts on the Long-Term Financial Planning Report for the attention of the Board, to send him a note and he will bring these ideas forward in his summary to the Board. He indicated that it would be approximately another month before the Board will meet.

2007:12

Other Business

There were no items of other business.

2007:13

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00pm.

Faculty of Engineering Response
to the Board of Governors Report of the Long Term Financial Planning Committee

The Report of the Long Term Financial Planning Committee when adopted will have a significant impact on Dalhousie University. The report provides a number of important recommendations that will be crucial to building the University. There are, however, a few items in the report that require clarification:

1. Recommendation 7, the so-called anomaly regarding Engineering Education;
2. accounting; and
3. The Engineering Profession.

The Associated University System

Recommendation 7 states *“That the Board of Governors and the Administration work diligently to resolve the anomalous situation with respect to Engineering education in Nova Scotia so that the Dalhousie Faculty of Engineering can be internationally competitive and can meet the Province’s science and technology objectives.”*

It is our belief the current system is not optimal. However, it is naïve to believe that changing the system will have a significant impact on our so-called bottom line. This is a red-herring. Focusing energy on destroying the Associated University system would be a significant distraction and would not, in our opinion, provide the desired increase in our first- and second-year classes. At the same time there is a non-trivial risk that we would have significantly diminished the third- and fourth-year classes. This is not to say that Dalhousie should try and maintain the *status-quo*. There are a number of initiatives that could be pursued. There are also a number of issues with regards to how we deliver our program which relate to the Associated University system which could be significantly improved.

There are five Associated Universities - Acadia, St. FX, St Mary’s, CBU, NSAC. Each of them has a different relationship with Dalhousie. The report attributes 562 students to the AU’s enrolled in years I and II for 2004/5. Many of these are in 3-year programmes.

Although UPEI is not a Nova Scotia University, the special relationship we have with them facilitates the recruitment of Island students into Dalhousie in third year.

The relationship between Dalhousie and the NS Associated Universities is somewhat more complicated. It is clear that if the system was not in place Dalhousie would stand to gain a significant number of students into first year, however, it also stands to lose a significant number of students into third and fourth year. It would be folly to believe that this increase in students would be as high as 50% of the AU students. There are at least three groups of students affected.

- Those that apply to Dalhousie and are not accepted because their high school average is below 70%. Many of these choose the Associated Universities that accept students with averages above 60%.
- Students that want to do their first two years at home. These are mainly students at CBU and NSAC. We believe that we would gain a few of these if the AU system was not in place, however in the case of CBU, Memorial University would attract many of these students.
- Of the remaining students we believe that we would not attract many of these students to Dalhousie. Many of the foreign students that come into 3rd year start at AU’s.
- An initial approximate estimate indicates an increase from 1263 to 1330 students if the AU system did not exist.

The negative impacts of dismantling the AU system are:

- A very large expenditure of time, energy, political will, and money for a very small gain (an increase of 60-70 students);
- The alienation of a large percentage of the Nova Scotia Technical College (NSTC, and Technical University of Nova Scotia (TUNS) alumni; and

- It would draw our energies away from building a better Faculty of Engineering

Budget Analysis

We have some significant questions regarding the accounting. We would like to point out that we have approximately 10% of the student body and our operating budget is approximately 6% of the total budget of the University. The question is how the remaining administrative costs of the University are distributed to show a profit or a loss. The Faculty of Engineering operating budget is, like all Faculties, driven by salary costs. Our operating budget is \$8,800/student as compared to \$7,900/student in Science and \$11,100/student in Computer Science. This slightly higher cost per student over Science is in part explained in that virtually all of our faculty members and some of our technical staff are Professional Engineers and like the other professional faculties we have to compete with industry for human resources. The variance with Computer Science is inexplicable.

The attribution of other costs is somewhat more difficult to understand, primarily because there is no explanation as to how they were generated. The most troubling of these is the \$4,127,000 attributed to our physical plant. There are three concerns with this figure.

1. Up until September 2006 none of the classrooms within Engineering were assigned to the common classroom pool. If we understand the calculation this would significantly inflate our percentage of total Faculty space.
2. There is a significant percentage of engineering space which is unusable because it is in such poor repair. We estimate this to be roughly 20,000 sq feet. On top of this Facilities Management rates our Chemical Engineering, Minerals Engineering and Materials Engineering buildings as the three worst buildings on the Dalhousie Campus. Based on recent studies by Jacques Whitford the cost of renovation and refurbishment to bring them up to an acceptable standard for their intended use and to conform to current building codes is in the same ball-park as replacing them.
3. Although it is reasonable to assign an operating cost to all space within the University there is one significant anomaly. According to information presented at the Presidential retreat in 2005, approximately 3% of the capital expenditures over the previous 7 years were spent on Engineering, yet the portion of the Facilities Management budget attributed to Engineering is 14%. Clearly this figure needs to be adjusted.

Professional Faculty

One important factor that is not addressed in the analysis of Engineering is that it is a Professional Faculty and as such has some significant added costs: namely;

- The additional costs relating to restrictions placed on us because of accreditation; and
- Competition with Industry for Faculty Members that increases our salary costs.

Conclusions

1. The analysis should be redone taking into consideration the issues raised: namely space, lack of investment in engineering infrastructure, and accounting for the value of Engineering to the Province of Nova Scotia and the Country.
2. Do not take any precipitous action regarding the Associated University system.
3. The President and the Board of Governors should be working with the Province to invest in the infrastructure and operation of the Faculty of Engineering to create an internationally competitive and modern school of engineering.

From: Raymond Klein <Ray.Klein@dal.ca>

Date: December 13, 2006 8:20:14 PM AST

To: Tom Traves <tom.traves@dal.ca>

Cc: Carolyn Watters <carolyn.watters@Dal.Ca>, Sunny Marche<sunny.marche@DAL.CA>

Subject: a few comments on the Long Term Financial Planning Report

Dear President Traves,

Generally I thought this was an excellent report. I am very appreciative of the huge amount of work that was put into it and thank the committee members for this.

Below are a few (very few) quotations from the report that I felt a need to comment on. My comments are preceded by **. If I have a disagreement with the report it is in reaction to what is implied by the recommendation (see p. 9 and 39) that we seek a “better balance” between graduate and undergraduate enrolment (growth). As a reinforcement of my complaint, I have reproduced, at the end of this e-mail, the prologue from the 2000 Senate Review of FGS.

Notes on LTFP Nov 29, 2006

p. 9: From Recommendations (see also p. 39): “That the University set a target for graduate enrolment which better balances Dalhousie’s traditional strengths in post-graduate education with the proportionate size of graduate enrolments at comparable universities. This target should be achieved by concentrating on undergraduate enrolment growth.”

**The rationale for this recommendation is rooted purely in tuition/revenue considerations. The broader context, that Dalhousie is the “research engine” of the province as well as a magnet for highly qualified personnel (HQP) to come to the region (as graduate students, post-doctoral fellows [PDFs], visiting professors, technicians, etc.) is not recognized here. Moreover, even if the report’s understanding of the province’s funding formula were correct (and Dean Watters doesn’t think it is) this recommended rebalancing is rooted in the idea that this formula is immutable.

Decisions as important as how many graduate students it would be good for Dalhousie (and therefore the province, since we train about 80% of the total) to be training should not be rooted in narrow accounting considerations. Consider that, in an effort to double the number of graduate students in their province, Ontario is offering to universities a \$24,000 per student incentive for each additional graduate student the university attracts. The rebalancing that is needed here is at the level of the provincial government. Our political leaders must be made to see that our economic prosperity requires us to compete effectively for HQP, beginning with graduate students. And this is not a topic of interest only to the education portfolio. Presently the province's population is shrinking. But every graduate student we train from away has a chance of remaining here. Hence, graduate training should be of interest to the immigration and economic development portfolios.

p. 10: “But higher fees at Dalhousie reflect also the University’s mandate to offer higher- cost graduate and professional programming for the Province (and in many cases the region), the concentration of enrolment in these higher-cost programs (see Section B on Enrolment), and the need to support extensive research activities (see Section J on Research).”

**As noted, this may be inaccurate. But, if the cost of educating a graduate student is underecognized by the provincial formula, then the report should be recommending that we seek to have the formula repaired. Moreover, isn’t it the case that the funding formula completely ignores the even higher level training provided to PDFs. Well, we don’t even know how to count them ourselves. But we are working on this. We should make sure this training becomes reflected in the formula.

p. 15: "Dalhousie is a major Canadian university with enviable credentials and aggressive aspirations. To a great degree its achievements in the areas of research and graduate studies have been founded on the strength of its endowments and the vision of its donors. Maintaining and enhancing its levels of achievement in these areas over the coming decades to a very large degree will be based on growth in the endowments. "

p. 17 (and elsewhere): "The limited public support provided by the Provincial Government to Nova Scotians who desire university education, including the complete absence of any graduate scholarship program, must be corrected if Nova Scotia hopes to prosper and develop. "

**I was very happy to see these important endorsements and suggestions (p. 15, 17). And I am hopeful that the Task Force on Graduate Student Funding will set in motion a process leading to provincial legislation establishing a graduate scholarship program aimed at supporting high quality graduate students who are trained in Nova Scotian universities.

Ray Klein

Excerpt from the Report of the Committee to Review FGS (2000):

"Dalhousie is the smallest full service university in Canada, yet we have the largest graduate programme east of Quebec and, compared with all Canadian universities, the highest percentage of students in the more costly graduate and professional programmes. Although we are in a poor province that allocates no money* for graduate scholarships, we have an internationally respected research infrastructure that attracts close to \$50 million dollars in grants and contracts annually. Our professional graduate programmes produce highly trained individuals for employment in local, regional, national, and international settings. Our academic graduate programmes generate scholars of the highest caliber who go on to fill positions in academia and to join government, corporate and other entities where the skills they acquired here are applied in cultural, commercial, educational, and other spheres to improve the welfare of Canadians. Dalhousie has graduate programmes in most of its disciplines, and many of these programmes have international reputations that attract the finest students. It cannot be overstated how important this is for Dalhousie's reputation as an institution of higher learning, research, and scholarship. The possibility of supervising high quality graduate students serves as a critical lure for attracting and keeping outstanding faculty. Indeed, quality graduate programmes are the linchpin of Dalhousie's current reputation as a first rate university, and of our continued success as a research engine for Atlantic Canada."

*This is no longer true, as we now have a graduate scholarship program in health (run by NSHRF).