

Item: Senate Minutes, June 1998  
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 June 1998. 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, June 29, 1998 at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Bell, Bleasdale, Boychuk, Bradfield, Camfield, Chiasson, Clements, Connolly, Crocker, Cunningham, Egan, Emodi, Galley, Gantar, Guppy, Hyndman, Kimmins, Kipouros, MacInnis, Maloney, McIntyre, Morrissey, Neumann, Patriquin, H. Powell, Ricketts, Rosson, Sutherland (for Ryall), Scassa, Shepherd, Siddiq, Thiessen, Thompson, Traves, Ugursal.

Regrets: Archibald, Binkley, Bishop, Cameron, Coffin, Farmer, Faulkner, Fooladi, Furrow, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Lee, MacDonald, MacKenzie, Morehouse, Phillips, Rathwell, Robertson, Ruedy, Russell, Shafai, Slonim, Tindall, Tomblin Murphy, Vohra, Wallace, White, Wrixon.

Invitees: C. Hartzman, A. Jost, V. Lee, M. MacGillivray.

On behalf of Senate, Mr. Stuttard thanked those members in attendance for whom this was their last meeting: Mr. Egan, Mr. Gantar, Mr. Siddiq, and Ms. Thompson. Senate was equally grateful to those out-going members unable to be with us. He wished all well.

**98:089.**

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

**98:090.**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of June 8, 1998 were adopted as circulated.

**98:091.**

Nominations to Senate Committees

Mr. Boran presented the following motions from the Senate Nominating Committee:

**That Senate approve the nomination to the Senate Steering Committee of Philip Girard (Law) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2000.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee of Moira McConnell (Law) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 1999.**

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Committee on Academic Administration of J. Norman Scrimger (Computer Science) January 1999 - June 1999; and Mysore Satish (Engineering) July 1, 1998 to June 30, 2000.**

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Academic Appeals Committee of Richard Devlin (Law) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001 and Abdel Farrag (Computer Science) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 1999.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the Senate Discipline Committee of Audrey Macklin (Law) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001.**

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Committee on the Environment of Ray Cote (Management) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2000; Michel Joffres (Medicine) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2000; Austin Parsons (Architecture) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2000; Donald Patton (Management) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 1999; and Martin Willison (Science) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 1999.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the Senate Physical Planning Committee of John Baxter (FA&SS) July 1, 1998 to June 30, 1999.**

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Committee on Instructional Development of Robert Loney (Dentistry) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 1999; Tim Lee (Science) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001; J. Norman Scrimger (Computer Science) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001; Z. David Chen (Engineering) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2000; and Dale Poel (Management) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2000.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the Senate Library Committee of Qigang Gao (Computer Science) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the Board of Governor's Student Relations & Residence Committee of Tom Faulkner (FA&SS) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2000.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the University Hearing Committee of Tom Faulkner (FA&SS) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the University Public Relations Committee of Colin Stuttard (Science) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the Nova Scotia Agricultural College Faculty Council of Nick Morgunov (Medicine) July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001.**

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared the nominees **ACCLAIMED** members of the respective committees.

Mr. Traves noted that the University Public Relations Committee had not met during his time at Dalhousie, nor for several years prior to his coming. To him that suggested this was a non-functioning

committee that might be disbanded, and he requested the advice of the Chair as to how this should be accomplished. His understanding was that this was a University or Presidential, and not a Senate Committee. Mr. Stuttard had unearthed information concerning a Senate Public Relations Committee, abolished in the late 1980s, and succeeded by a joint Board-Senate Committee which had functioned for at least a year and had produced the document "Public Relations for Dalhousie" in December, 1990. The terms of reference of the joint Senate-Board Committee had been under review in 1993, but Mr. Stuttard had been unable to locate any revised terms of reference, though it appeared that the size of the membership had been reduced. After 1993 the Committee apparently ceased to function.

Mr. Traves gave Notice of Motion that, at the discretion of the Chair, he wished to bring to a subsequent Senate meeting a motion to abolish the University Public Relations Committee. Mr. Crocker requested that Senators be allowed to review the Committee's terms of reference before voting on whether to abolish a body which might serve a useful purpose. Mr. Bradfield clarified that in the early to mid-1980s he had chaired the Senate Committee which had functioned in parallel to the Board's Public Relations Committee. The Senate Committee had made recommendations concerning Dalhousie's public relations efforts, and had sponsored workshops in which media people had explained to faculty what issues might interest the press, and how to best present those issues. Subsequently, as a member of the joint Board-Senate Committee, Mr. Bradfield had found the momentum came from Senate, not the Board. Initially the joint Committee had not been chaired by the President, but it seemed to Mr. Bradfield that once the then President had become its chair the Committee had petered out.

**98:092.**

SCAA Motions Regarding Academic Assessment

On behalf of SCAA, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

- i) **That with the exception of those students enrolled in at least one "R" class in a given academic year, students' academic standing be assessed at the end of each academic term.**
- ii) **That the "levels", as defined in the May 11, 1998, Memorandum from the Registrar, Ms. Curri, be as follows:**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Faculties</b>
<b>AC</b>	<b>Architecture</b>
<b>UG</b>	<b>Arts and Social Sciences</b>
	<b>Computer Science</b>
	<b>Engineering</b>
	<b>Journalism</b>
	<b>Management</b>
	<b>Science</b>
<b>HP</b>	<b>Health Professions</b>
<b>MD</b>	<b>Medicine</b>
<b>LW</b>	<b>Law</b>
<b>DN</b>	<b>Dentistry</b>
<b>GR</b>	<b>Graduate Studies</b>

- iii) **That each term the Registrar's Office shall report to each Faculty the names of students who were academically dismissed or failed to graduate after having**

**changed programs within a "Level"; and that this provision shall apply only to students enrolled prior to May 1, 1999.**

Ms. MacGillivray, Associate Registrar, gave a brief illustrated presentation which took members through a series of questions and answers providing background information to the motions before Senate, beginning with an explanation of the issues involving Level in BANNER. Level was a fundamental element in BANNER, intended to group students who were governed by the same general set of rules and regulations. Significant academic processes related to Level were calculation of GPA to determine academic standing and eligibility for the Dean's List; class offerings and enrolment restrictions; grade assignments; and degree rules. At present Senators were being asked to consider Level and GPA. Dalhousie currently calculated a sessional and cumulative GPA by degree; BANNER calculated a term and cumulative GPA by Level. In order to determine how many levels we needed at Dalhousie, and how many it was advisable to employ, the BANNER working group had questioned other universities using BANNER and discovered that many used only three levels: undergraduate, graduate, and professional. However, three would not be enough for Dalhousie, since Dalhousie used more than three grading schemes and a Level was required for each of those schemes. The team had considered and rejected the idea of maintaining the status quo and creating one Level for each degree, primarily for two reasons. Firstly, we only required a Level for each grading scheme. Secondly, the team took seriously the advice of the vendor that we would exceed a maximum of ten Levels at our peril, given our tight implementation schedule, and the fact that we had no fall-back system to deal with the year-2000 problem. The team also considered the fact that the number of Levels chosen would have to reflect the number of levels of entry to undergraduate programs at Dalhousie: the first entry level, direct from high school; and the second entry level, based on some previous university work.

The Faculties clustered within the Undergraduate Level shared three key characteristics: most of their programs were first entry; they used the same grading scheme; and most of the movement from one degree to another occurred within and between these Faculties. It was important to understand that Faculties would not have to change their academic standing rules as a result of being grouped in a single Level. Faculties within the same Level could have different rules. For example, Management could continue to use 2.0 for calculation of good standing and graduation, and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences could continue to use 1.7 for the same calculations. That was because BANNER calculated a Level GPA, but used Faculty rules to determine whether a student was in good standing. We would still have the flexibility to calculate a degree GPA and an Honours GPA by using the CAPP (degree audit) module.

Would moving to a Level GPA affect current students? It would affect students who changed degrees within a Level, but had failed classes. Those failed classes were currently left behind with the change of degree. Under BANNER, everything taken within the same Level would become part of the calculation of the students' GPAs. An examination of the list of B.Sc. and B.A. potential graduates for May 1998 had revealed that of the 870 students, 165 had changed degree, and 85 of those had changed with no failing grades left behind. Ms. MacGillivray had pulled out 20 from the 80 students who had changed degrees and left failing grades behind, had recalculated those students' eligibility to graduate under the proposed system, and had discovered that only one student would have been ineligible to graduate this year using BANNER's Level GPA calculation. What would we do with those currently enrolled students who might be academically dismissed or fail to graduate as a result of moving to a Level GPA? The third motion proposed that the Registrar's Office provide a list of students so affected to the Faculties, and that Faculties take the appropriate action. This followed past practice in that it gave a student the benefit of graduating under the old rules when application of new rules would impact them negatively.

Ms. MacGillivray assured Mr. Ugursal that the proposed changes would not be a problem for the approximately 50% of students in Engineering who came from other universities rather than directly from high school. However, she confirmed that within a Level different grading schemes would not be possible. Were a Faculty within the Undergraduate Level to change its grading scheme, a new Level would need to be created. Ms. MacGillivray and Mr. Stuttard explained that a Faculty's decision to change its grading scheme would go before SCAA, and then be forwarded to Senate for approval. Ms. Thompson asked about the implications of the relationship between Level and enrolment, as indicated on one of Ms. MacGillivray's illustrations, and about any additional and broader implications of the proposed adoption of Level, of which Senators needed to be aware. Ms. MacGillivray clarified that BANNER offered an additional way of reserving enrolment places -- by Level. As far as the BANNER team knew, at this point, the grouping of Faculties under one Undergraduate Level did not appear to present further problems. But she could not guarantee this. Mr. Bradfield asked whether the proposal that students taking "R" classes be assessed at the end of the class meant that students could also be assessed by year, and not just by term, as the handout indicated. Ms. MacGillivray clarified that BANNER calculated GPA by term and cumulatively. The "R" class mark would count for both terms; would be inserted for both terms at the end of the year; and would affect the GPA for the prior term retroactively. Mr. Cunningham noted that he needed grades by the end of January in order to decide on interviews for Dentistry, and wondered how he would get the mid-term grades for "R" classes. Would he need to change his admissions process? Ms. MacGillivray indicated he would have the "A" class grades by January, but not mid-term grades for "R" classes. Mr. Gantar wondered how the proposed change in the timing of assessment would affect the allocation of scholarships. Would Dalhousie need to consider offering scholarships per term, if GPA calculation were to be by term? Ms. MacGillivray responded that the team would be bringing forward a proposal concerning scholarships, but that the issue of GPA by term would not be a problem in this area.

In response to questions from Mr. Bradfield, Ms. MacGillivray explained that for a student who had completed a B.Comm. at Dalhousie, then completed a B.A., also at Dalhousie, the student's cumulative GPA for the B.A. would include grades from the B. Comm., since both degrees would fall within the one Undergraduate Level. The degree (AUDIT) GPA would provide an overall degree GPA; however, that would not be the basis for calculating academic standing. Were a student to transfer from one Level to a different Level, then the cumulative GPA would only be based on the work taken in the second Level.

Ms. Bleasdale reported on the deliberations at SCAA concerning creation of a greater number of Levels than was being proposed, possibly a Level for each Faculty. For a variety of reasons the Committee had asked Ms. Virginia Lee, Project Manager of BANNER, to review further the technical issues involved in creating additional Levels, and specifically address the concerns raised by the Dean of Computer Science, Mr. Slonim. Subsequent to discussions with Ms. Lee, Mr. Slonim had emailed Senate Office to the effect that he accepted that the proposed number of Levels was the only option for Dalhousie, given the limitations of BANNER. In his opinion an increase in the number of Levels "would cause considerable delay and cost." Level was "a fundamental part of the system we [had] bought." There [was] no option here -- it [was] a physical limitation of the system." Ms. Bleasdale hoped those Deans, the Chair of Senate, and others present who had participated in SCAA's deliberations, would be reassured by Mr. Slonim's conclusions.

Mr. Stuttard asked members to consider motion (i) from SCAA. Mr. Bradfield recalled that earlier in the year Senators had been presented with the possibility that the vendor might consider adapting its system to accommodate "R" classes, in order to expand its market to include those Canadian universities on the "R" class system. Ms. Lee indicated that Dalhousie had gone back to SCT, and she was pleased to report that the vendor was looking into modifications. We would follow proposed changes carefully to attempt

to ensure they fitted our needs. Mr. Neumann received clarification that Dalhousie was moving to term, rather than sessional, assessment because BANNER assessed by term, not session.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Stuttard asked members to consider motion (ii) from SCAA. The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Stuttard asked members to consider motion (iii) from SCAA. Speaking to the list of suggested advantages of BANNER, Mr. Ugursal wondered whether some, such as checking prerequisites and credit equivalencies, might turn into disadvantages by pushing more work onto the faculty. Ms. MacGillivray explained that students would be able to access some of these options themselves, on line. Also, the wait-list facility was not presently maintained by the Registrar's Office. It would enable faculty to choose who to accept from a wait-list. A number of options would make life easier for both students and faculty. In response to Mr. Bradfield's question concerning how the submission and calculation of grades would work, Ms. MacGillivray was pleased to report that SCT was presently looking at a grading package developed by one of BANNER's users, which would expand the capacity of the suite in this area, enabling faculty to use this system to calculate as well as record grades. Ms. MacGillivray and Mr. Stuttard also explained that the third motion stipulated students "prior to May 1, 1999" because of the principal that students were entitled to finish their programs under the rules under which they had started.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Stuttard thanked Ms. MacGillivray and Ms. Lee for presenting the material and answering members' questions.

**98:093.**

Institute for Global Information Networking

Mr. Stuttard welcomed Carl Hartzman and Allan Jost, the Acting Dean of Computer Science, who would answer questions concerning the proposed motion from SAPBC:

**That the proposal to establish an Institute for Global Information Networking be approved.**

Mr. Rosson spoke strongly in support of the bold and imaginative proposal developed over nine months by the new Faculty of Computer Science and its Dean, Mr. Slonim. He welcomed the vision of Computer Science connecting units across the University, and working to develop multi-disciplinary programs. The Faculty of Management looked forward to collaborating with Computer Science, particularly in the creation of the electronic commerce initiative referred to in the proposal. Dean Ricketts also strongly supported the Institute as an important endeavour in an area into which a number of major universities were moving. He clarified that the proposals for graduate programs had not yet come to Senate for approval, but were being pursued and would come up through the normal channels. The Institute would have much to contribute to a number of existing programs, and to new inter-disciplinary graduate programs. Mr. Neumann asked whether the proposal met the requirement that a new Institute identify funding for five years. It appeared to have secure funding for only three. Mr. Stuttard indicated the Institute could go forward provided SAPBC and Senate were satisfied that funding was available for the three- to five-year period usually identified in such proposals.

Mr. Crocker wondered whether the telemedicine envisioned in the proposal could ever become fully cost

recoverable, given the incredible cost of up to roughly \$1000 per consultation. Had we had a cost efficiency study in this area? Were the high costs attributable to the “growing pains” of telemedicine? Mr. Hartzman thought the question was not germane to the proposal to establish the Institute. However, he explained that telemedicine was in its early stage of development and consequently expensive, as were other evolving technologies such as interactive televised lectures, much more expensive than the interactive lectures over the internet, which were being developed. At present the Institute was discussing potential projects which, when proposed for funding, would require the type of cost analysis Mr. Crocker had in mind. The Institute might well be asked to address the broader questions Mr. Crocker raised.

Ms. Bleasdale asked Mr. Hartzman to further clarify a point discussed by SAPBC. On page 15, item 5 (a), the first paragraph read: “existing academic staff will be contracted on a consultative basis. Contracts will be by mutual agreement and will supplement members’ existing contracts and obligations”. At SAPBC Mr. Hartzman had indicated this referred “primarily to research contracts.” She would feel more comfortable were he to agree that this referred only to research contracts. If it did refer to teaching, would this be teaching compensated according to the provisions in the collective agreement for routine overload teaching? Mr. Hartzman indicated teaching was included; specifically, teaching activities that involved faculty in multi-disciplinary programs, such as the electronic commerce program under construction, and in substantial curriculum development where the program would be managed by the Institute and would involve an external client. That type of work would be rewarded other than by the provisions for overload teaching. Ms. Bleasdale wondered whether the intention was to be able to attract and retain individuals who might normally not consider faculty positions at the salary rate normally offered to members covered by the Collective Agreement with the DFA. Mr. Hartzman confirmed that was partially the intent. He noted that at present the Faculty was paying an external consultant to develop programs. Mr. Ugursal observed that he was in the process of developing a program, without extra compensation. The principle operating here appeared unacceptable.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**98:094.**

Honorary Degrees Committee

On behalf of the Honorary Degrees Committee, Mr. Traves Moved:

**That the terms of reference of the HDC, “Procedures 4”, be amended to read: “4. not consider for honorary degrees members of the Board of Governors, faculty, or staff (whether holding full-time or part-time appointments); but may consider an individual with a post-retirement, non-continuing appointment, the nature of which, in the judgement of the Committee, does not involve that individual in the day-to-day operations of the University.”**

As Chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee, the President explained this proposed amendment had arisen from a number of instances in which individuals had been considered, but declared ineligible for an honorary degree because they received some modest remuneration for a minor role in the University following their retirement. Mr. Crocker noted that most faculty members in the Faculty of Medicine were part-time. Would this change mean a member switching back and forth from full-time to part-time within that Faculty would now become eligible for an honorary degree? Mr. Traves clarified that this motion addressed those who had retired, whether at age 65 or earlier. The issues with which the Committee had wrestled were, on the one hand, the internal politics and the apparent unseemliness of



such practices as decorating our own, and on the other hand, our present inability to honour members after years of service to the Dalhousie community.

Ms. McIntyre expressed support for the spirit of the motion, but noted that the new contract with CUPE covering part-time faculty stipulated that no more than six part-time post-retirement appointments be allowed per Faculty. Full-time post-retirement appointments were different and required formal procedures for the appointment to be made. At Ms. McIntyre's suggestion, and on behalf of the Honorary Degrees Committee, Mr. Traves accepted a friendly amendment to insert "part-time" between "post-retirement" and "non-continuing".

Mr. Bradfield suggested a further friendly amendment: deletion of the words following "appointment". Since he considered teaching to be part of the day-to-day operations of the University, he did not understand what type of post-retirement appointment the Committee was attempting to exclude. Mr. Traves responded that the Committee had struggled with the difficult task of crafting wording to cover all potential problems. He believed the principle was what was important here, and the phrase could be deleted. If the Committee erred in its application of the principle, it could report to Senate, and Senate could correct the Committee. Ms. Bleasdale recalled that Committee members had been concerned about the type of appointment that might be construed as maintaining the nominee's position in the chain or line of command. Mr. Bradfield suggested, and Mr. Traves accepted the friendly amendment to delete "operation" and insert "administration".

Mr. Stuttard advised members that at least two-thirds of members voting must be in favour for the motion to pass. He then read the revised motion:

**That the terms of reference of the Honorary Degrees Committee, "Procedures", 4, be amended to read: "4. not consider for honorary degrees members of the Board of Governors, faculty or staff (whether holding full-time or part-time appointments), but may consider an individual with a post-retirement, non-continuing, part-time appointment, the nature of which, in the judgement of the Committee, does not involve that individual in the day-to-day administration of the University."**

The motion as amended was **CARRIED** without dissent.

**98:095.**

SPPC Annual Report

On behalf of SPPC, Mr. Bradfield moved:

**The Senate accept the Senate Physical Planning Committee's Annual Report for 1997/98.**

Ms. McIntyre was curious to read that the Committee had been informed there had been no classroom renovations funded in A&R this year. What had been the explanation? Mr. Bradfield responded there had been no explanation. The Committee had noted the unusual transfer of \$600,000 from the A&R budget to help pay for what initially had been a recommendation to the Board for a new heating plant at DalTech. That amount per year was now to be allocated for three or more years to build a steam pipe-line that could eventually be operated by Nova Scotia Power and Trigen, their partner for a district heating system emanating from the Tufts Cove power plant. The A&R funds had been specifically set up to prevent the University from using them for Capital projects or for supplementing faculty salaries. In Committee some members had argued that transfer of the \$600,000 had eliminated the flexibility for

things like classroom renovations. Ms. McIntyre wished it noted that the absence of classroom renovation funds this year had seriously hurt her Faculty; she did not know about other Faculties. Her Faculty's process of curriculum implementation, based on classroom renovations, had been seriously interrupted this year.

Mr. Ugursal asked for Mr. Bradfield's comments on the long-range planning in the last sentence of Section F of his Report. Who would be responsible for this? As Chair of SPPC, Mr. Bradfield had pushed this year for a hard look at long-range planning and the University plan. The issue of property acquisition was addressed specifically because the Committee had interpreted the purchase of a piece of property as a clear policy question, particularly at a time when the whole University plan appeared to be out of sync with the reality of the University. When originally asked about long-range planning, University administrators on the Committee had indicated that was not the concern of SPPC. Now that it appeared this type of planning would proceed, Mr. Bradfield assured Senators that were he to continue as Chair of SPPC he would push for the Committee's active involvement in the process. He was troubled when he saw the purchase of a property "because it completed a square".

Mr. Traves clarified that Dalhousie had purchased the building on Morris Street sitting between two University buildings. We had been approached to buy it, and the rental revenues covered the full cost of the mortgage value of the property; it would have been short-sighted not to take advantage of a property situated in the middle of likely future development. Mr. Hyndman asked whether there was a Committee of the Board or University tasked with dealing with long-term physical planning. Mr. Traves responded that at present there was no ongoing review of the Campus plan, developed in 1990, but he believed projects had come forward in the context of that plan. It might be reasonable to revisit the plan.

Referring to Other Business in the Report, Mr. Egan asked about the impact on parking of the new buildings under construction. Mr. Bradfield referred back to earlier SPPC discussions of parking during consideration of the new Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences building. The idea of a parkade behind Henson College was uncertain because of neighbours' concerns. He reminded members of the city's requirement that Dalhousie have a certain number of parking spots. Mr. Traves clarified that there would be an increase of 5 or 6 spaces on completion of all the building projects. The Arts and Social Sciences Building would have underground parking providing the same number of spaces as were currently available in that spot above ground. For Computer Science, discussions with neighbours would change the point of entry to what would still be a parkade running between two streets. Changes in physical arrangements on Oxford Street would involve leveling the Day Care Centre and moving the facility into one of the properties vacated on completion of the FA&SS building. King's was also planning for a new building. In sum, we would be able to meet the municipal parking requirement. Mr. Bradfield noted that the underground parking would be at an increased rate, comparable to the rate for underground parking at the Medical School. The revenue would help to fund the new building.

**98:096.**

#### Report of the President

Mr. Traves was pleased to announce that Dalhousie had received \$1 million from the Windsor Foundation, through the Capital Campaign, for the Arts and Social Sciences Building. A major company had also committed to funding a Chair for Engineering under the Industrial Chair's Program of NSERC. Turning to enrolments, the President announced Dalhousie was currently on target for the coming year. Enrolments were slightly up in Science, Management, Engineering, Architecture, Computer Science, and slightly down in Arts and Social Sciences, but he hoped initiatives of the past month would improve the situation for Arts and Social Sciences.

The President congratulated individuals recently honoured for their contributions to Dalhousie. Recipients of this year's Rosemary Gill Award were Judy Dunn, Bruce Earhardt, and Elizabeth Foy. Recipients of the first University Community Awards were Patrick Christopher, Margaret White, Fred Fountain, and Mary Miller.

Mr. Bradfield asked whether there had been a change in policy regarding the funding of Chairs. Over the last few years funding of a Chair named after a benefactor had cost approximately \$2.5 to 3 million. But lately a few Chairs had been funded partially by specific benefactors and partially from the Capital Campaign. Mr. Traves pointed out the need to make a distinction between an endowed Chair, permanently endowed to cover the salary of a faculty member, and an NSERC Industrial Chair, for which the University could apply for matching NSERC funds if it had been promised a minimum of \$500,000 over 5 years. The latter were based on particular research programs. They did not fall into the category of endowed Chairs, which would normally involve a sum of at least \$2 million invested to provide salary support. Most of the faculty appointments secured under the Capital Campaign had been of the NSERC type, and could be renewed under the NSERC program. Mr. Traves also pointed out that the Capital Campaign benefitted from benefactors. Consequently, it was not inappropriate to augment one large contribution with several smaller contributions.

Mr. Ugursal asked the President to speak to an article in the Spring issue of the Alumni magazine announcing that in the Fall of 1998 Dalhousie would be offering the first Biomedical Engineering Program east of Montreal, through a Department of Biomedical Engineering. Mr. Traves agreed with Mr. Ugursal that the news story was premature. A Department of Biomedical Engineering had not been established; a group within the Faculty of Engineering was working with the architects of the proposed program to create a structure through which it might be offered.

**98:097.**

Consideration of Candidates for Honorary Degrees

The meeting moved *in camera* for this item.

**98:098.**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.