

Item: Senate Minutes, January 2002
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for January 2002. 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 14, 2002, at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, MacDonald Building.

Present with Mr. Lloyd Fraser (Vice-Chair) in the chair were the following:

Ben-Abdallah, Binkley, Bleasdale, Bowie, Breckenridge, Caldwell, Caley, Cochrane, Corke, Coughlan, Cunningham, Downe-Wamboldt, Downie, Egan, Emodi, Fraser, Galarneau, Guppy, Gupta, Guy, Hart, Huebert, Jalilvand, Kwak, N. MacDonald, MacInnis, MacLean, Maes, McGrath, McIntyre, Moore, Morgan, Neves, O'Mara, Phillips, Powell, Rowe, Sastri, Saunders, Savoy, Schroeder, Schwarz, Scully, Slonim, Tindall, Tracey, Traves, Ugursal, Whyte.

Regrets: Coffin, Elder, El-Hawary, Murphy, Neumann, Starnes.

Invitees: Mr. Michael Lee, Mr. Barry Lesser, Mr. Robert Loney.

Mr. Fraser welcomed members. In the absence of the Chair of Senate it was his privilege to chair the meeting.

2002:001.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

2002:002.

Minutes of a Previous Meeting

Ms. Corke was added to the list of those in attendance, and the minutes of the meeting of 26 November, 2001, were adopted as amended.

2002:003.

Report of the Chair

Mr. Fraser reported that MPHEC had approved the Palliative Medicine Residency Program.

2002:004.

Question Period

Vice-President Scully asked members to review the circulated sheet which contained the final tally of students enrolled as of December 1, 2001.

Mr. Whyte noted that Dalhousie had a very small bookstore, a smaller computer store, and an even smaller sports store, in comparison to such stores on other University campuses. These provided identity and focus for the community. Why were our resources so small in these areas?

Mr. Traves responded that these were ancillary services and as such were expected to pay their own way. The managers of these undertakings were very competent and ambitious and would welcome the opportunity for expansion. The size of the stores was dictated by the nature of the local market.

Ms. Galarneau had been alerted by students to the fact that in Commerce and Engineering, in particular, they were having trouble securing Co-op placements. Were there enough jobs available for the numbers enrolled in those programs? Mr. Scully was unaware of these problems. If Ms. Galareau would put her concerns in an email, he would investigate and report back to the next Senate meeting. The state of the economy regularly affected Co-op programs. Because the economy was not homogeneous, the impact on programs varied.

In response to Mr. McGrath's question, Mr. Fraser indicated that the BAC XXII would be on the agenda for the next meeting of Senate.

2002:005.

Amendment to the Terms of Reference of SCAA

On behalf of SCAA, Mr. Fraser moved:

That the terms of reference of the Senate Committee on Academic Administration, Composition 1(a), first sentence, be amended to read: seven faculty members elected by the Senate; at least one of these shall be an elected Faculty senator.

Mr. Scully reminded Senators that the reconstruction of this Committee had been approved the previous summer. The Nominating Committee had encountered difficulties in securing the two elected Senators required by the terms of reference for SCAA, and had asked both Senators and then members of SCAA whether they would be agreeable to reducing the number of elected faculty Senators on this Committee from two to one. The number of ex officio members serving on SCAA would ensure that the Committee's concerns were adequately represented when items of business were brought to Senate.

Mr. Fraser reminded members that a motion to amend the Constitution required the support of two-thirds of members present and voting.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2002:006.

Academic Dates 2002/2003

On behalf of SCAA, Mr. Fraser moved:

That the Fall term shall begin on Thursday, September 5, 2002, and end on Monday, December 2, 2002, with an examination period Wednesday, December 4, 2002 to Saturday, December 14, 2002; and that the Winter term shall begin on Monday, January 6, 2003, and end on Monday, April 7, 2003, with an examination period Wednesday, April 9, 2003 to Monday, April 28, 2003.

Mr. Scully asked members to accept a correction to the motion. The understanding at SCAA had been that the examinations in the Winter term would end on Saturday, April 26, 2003. The corrected motion read:

That the Fall term shall begin on Thursday, September 5, 2002, and end on Monday, December 2, 2002, with an examination period Wednesday, December 4, 2002 to Saturday, December 14, 2002; and that the Winter term shall begin on Monday, January 6, 2003, and end on Monday, April 7, 2003, with an examination period Wednesday, April 9, 2003 to Saturday, April 26, 2003.

Mr. Scully spoke to the memorandum from the Secretary of Senate. In the attached four Options for Academic Dates considered by SCAA, the Fall term was identical. For the Winter term the Committee had considered the relationship between the first day of classes, the last day of classes, the first day of examinations, and last day of examinations, and the date of Convocation. Those days had to address the interests of the various constituents affected: the students, the faculty, and the Registrar's Office. The Committee had agreed that the proposed Academic Dates accommodated all of those interests, including the number of teaching days. Of particular importance to the Committee had been the question of when the second term should begin. Members had been persuaded that the starting date of January 6, 2003, would best address student concerns.

In response to Ms. Guppy, Mr. Scully explained that historically Dalhousie's Spring Convocation commenced on the Tuesday following Victoria Day in order to accommodate the high proportion of students who lived outside Halifax, and who stayed on in the city after classes and examinations ended rather than incur the expense of travelling home and then back for Convocation. Given the increasing pressures on the Registrar's Office and the logistics of processing grades and parchments, Mr. Scully did not know how much longer the University would be able to hold what was a relatively early Convocation.

Ms. Binkley pointed out that what used to be terms of 13 weeks had been reduced to 12 weeks and one or two days. The Senate needed to consider the impact of this shortened teaching term on the quality of education. SCAA might strike a subcommittee to address some of the basic assumptions concerning the examination period. Could students be asked to write more than one examination a day? Could the examinations for larger classes, particularly those with non-

machine gradable examinations, be scheduled earlier in the examination period. This would help address problems instructors faced in attempting to submit grades in a timely fashion to the Registrar's Office. In turn, it would ease the pressure on the Registrar's Office to process grades in time for Convocation.

Mr. Saunders received clarification that the motion referred only to the basic undergraduate programs.

Mr. Scully agreed that a number of issues, including those raised by Ms. Binkley, needed to be addressed.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2002:007.

Combined Diploma in Prosthodontics & Master of Applied Science in Biomedical Engineering Program

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Fraser moved:

That the Senate approve the proposal for a Combined Graduate Diploma in Prosthodontics and Master of Applied Science in Biomedical Engineering program, on the understanding that the Graduate Diploma in Prosthodontics can be completed only in combination with the Master of Applied Science in Biomedical Engineering and not as an independent program.

Mr. Fraser pointed out that the proposal approved by SAPBC and now before Senate included the transfer of funds to the library. Though that was not specifically referenced in the motion, it was spelled out in the proposal and therefore implicit, and in approving this motion Senators would be approving the modest transfers to the library recommended by the library assessment.

Mr. MacInnis thanked all those who had worked to make this proposed program possible. Two of those individuals were in attendance and would be happy to answer questions: Mr. Robert Loney, Prosthodontics and Dental Clinical Services, and Mr. Michael Lee, Director of the School of Biomedical Engineering. This important initiative took advantage of an unusual and welcome collaboration with the School of Biomedical Engineering. Mr. MacInnis extended a special thank you to Dean Caley of the Faculty of Engineering, Dean Kwak of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, Dean MacDonald of the Faculty of Medicine, and Mr. Ismet Ugursal for helping to advance this proposal.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2002:008.

Master of Engineering & Master of Applied Science in Environmental Engineering Program

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Fraser moved:

That the Senate approve the proposal for the establishment of new degree programs for a Master of Engineering in Environmental Engineering and a Master of Applied Science in Environmental Engineering.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2002:009.

M.A. in Economics (non-thesis) Program

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Fraser moved:

That the Senate approve the proposal for the establishment of a new non-thesis (i.e. class-based) degree stream for the Master of Arts degree in Economics.

Mr. Kwak explained that the proposal was for a new stream in the existing Masters degree in Economics. It recognized that many students found it desirable to pursue a large number of classes. Additional classes would be substituted for the thesis. Students would still be required to complete a special project.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2002:010.

For Information: BAC Report XXI

Mr. Fraser reminded members that the BAC Report XXI which dealt with ERBA and a new formula for transfers relating to graduate teaching was provided for their information. The Report had been submitted to the President and approved. BAC XXII would be considered at the next meeting of Senate.

2002:011.

President's Report

Mr. Traves had been asked how the University intended to spend the approximately \$3.5 mil in unanticipated tuition revenue generated by the increase in enrolment. Roughly half had already been allocated to help meet a number of current in-year budget requirements: the renovation of the residence at Gerard Hall (approx. \$455,000) which had enabled us to take in close to 200 first-year students; the more than \$.5 mil shortfall over the current budget year resulting from the substantial decline in interest rates that had hit the money the University had banked at short term rates; some of the new furniture for the new FASS building; and improvement of the University's website, an important part of enrolment management. Other, smaller expenditures were anticipated; however, by the end of the year the President expected to have retained possibly as much as \$1 mil for one-time use to offset pressures on the budget in the coming year.

Mr. Traves explained that the University was limited to spending this unanticipated revenue on projects of a one-time nature.

Speaking to BAC XXII, the President noted that, assuming no increase in the provincial operating grant and depending upon the rate of tuition increases for 2002/2003, the University would face a substantial budget shortfall for 2002/2003, likely between \$4 mil and \$5 mil. The exact amount would depend on a number of unknowns, including a potentially dramatic increase in the cost of electricity; the result of contract negotiations with NSGEU and the DFA. In order to enable some degree of advance planning, Deans and other administrative heads had been advised to expect substantial budget cuts for the coming year, probably in the neighbourhood of 3% to 4%. Members could assume that some of the increased tuition revenue from this year would flow through to Faculties for the coming year to help offset the impact of budget cuts for those Faculties which had experienced substantial enrolment increases. Mr. Traves emphasized, however, that the service units, the administrative units, did not benefit from increased tuition revenue, and not all Faculties had the capacity to grow. Those units would face substantial financial challenges during the coming year, as they had in years past.

The federal government had provided a one-time grant to help support those indirect costs of research which were now paid for by Dalhousie. The approximately \$200 mil would be distributed at the beginning of the next fiscal year, though exactly how and according to what rules it would be divided up remained unclear. Mr. Traves hoped to see a continuing federal program to support indirect costs of research annually, but until that was officially announced, the University would be unwise to commit the funds from this allocation to continuing costs. Many areas could benefit from a one-time infusion of money. He would consult with the Deans and administrative heads and the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee before making a final recommendation to the Board of Governors.

Along with the other Presidents of the Universities of Nova Scotia, Mr. Traves continued to lobby for increases to provincial grants. But the government was committed to balancing the budget in the next fiscal year. That meant members needed to be realistic about what could be expected from the provincial government.

In summary, over the next year the University faced a situation of relative luxury for special one-time projects and a serious shortfall in the basic operating budget which paid for essentials. These matters could be debated more fully at the next Senate meeting.

Mr. Hart had learned during his recent service on the Search Committee for the Dean of Science that the Faculty of Science spent almost 100% of the funds transferred to it on salaries for staff and faculty. Across the broader University, was there scope for absorbing a 3% or 4% budget cut at the Faculty level without losing large numbers of individuals, as well as their positions? Mr. Traves explained that some units would be able to cope better than others, but even in those Faculties which benefitted from the increased revenue brought in by an increase in students, resources would need to be found to teach those students. Over the coming year those units unable to accept more students, and the administrative units in particular, would face serious problems. Mr. Traves did not anticipate layoffs. But all units would have to try to make do in a variety of ways.

Mr. Slonim noted that as classes became bigger the quality of programs would go down.

2002:012.

Honorary Degrees

The meeting moved *in camera* for this item.

2002:013.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

APPROVED MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, January 28, 2002, at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, MacDonald Building.

Present with Mr. Lloyd Fraser (Vice-Chair) in the chair were the following:

Ben-Abdallah, Binkley, Bleasdale, Blunden, Bowie, Bradfield, Breckenridge, Caley, Cochrane, Corke, Cunningham, Emodi, Galarneau, Gupta, Hart, Jalilvand, Kwak, Loudon, B. MacDonald, MacInnis, Maes, McGrath, McIntyre, Milios, Mobbs, Moore, Neumann, O'Mara, Rajora, Rowe, Sastri, Saunders, Savoy, Schroeder, Schwarz, Scully, Slonim, Sommerfeld, Tindall, Tracey, Traves, Ugursal, Whyte.

Regrets: Caldwell, Coughlan, Egan, Elder, El-Hawary, Guppy, MacLean, Neves, Powell.

Invitees: Ms. Joan Conrod, Mr. Bryan Mason, Mr. Michael Shepherd, Mr. David Zitner.

Mr. Fraser welcomed members. In particular, he wished to welcome Mr. Hubert Morgan who had joined Senate in January as a representative for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

Mr. Fraser apologized for any inconvenience occasioned by the uncertainty as to whether the Senate meeting would be held. Senate Officers had been concerned that members receive their material in time to consider it carefully before the meeting. That would remain a priority for the Senate Office.

Mr. Fraser explained that the new seating arrangement was an attempt to bring Senators closer together physically and hopefully generate a less formal atmosphere. He asked members to provide their feedback.

2002:014.

Adoption of Agenda

Item 5, Day of Action, became item 3, and the agenda was adopted as amended.

2002:015.

Minutes of a Previous Meeting

Mr. Fraser noted that the minutes of the meeting of December 10, 2002, had been circulated by email and again at the meeting for information. Members would be asked to consider them for adoption at the next meeting of Senate.

2002:016.

Day of Action

Mr. Fraser invited Ms. Galarneau to speak to the motion concerning the Nova Scotia students' Day of Action. Ms. Galarneau moved (Mr. McGrath seconded):

Whereas students in this province are concerned about the Nova Scotia Government's neglect of post-secondary education;

Whereas students have seen 126.2% increase in tuition over the last 10 years;

Whereas the Nova Scotia Government is investing (\$20,196,425.69) less in Dalhousie than it was 10 years ago in constant dollars;

Whereas there are 511 fewer full-time faculty in the Maritimes, as compared to 1997, despite enrollment increases of over 5000 students;

Whereas Dalhousie has in excess of \$150 million in deferred maintenance;

Whereas students attending other post-secondary institutions have already been granted amnesty and/or clemency;

Whereas Nova Scotia students are uniting, for the first time ever, at a student rally to ask the Nova Scotia Government to reinvest in education:

Be it resolved that the Dalhousie Senate grant academic amnesty to those students who wish to participate in the February 6, 2002, province-wide Day of Action from 12 noon to 5 p.m.

Ms. Galarneau explained that the original motion circulated by email January 31, 2002, had been modified in two respects. In the sixth "Whereas", "including Saint Mary's" had been struck. There had been a miscommunication with the Student Union at Saint Mary's University. The faculty at Saint Mary's were in full support of granting academic amnesty to the students, but the Senate had not voted on the issue. It would be doing so at an emergency session.

The actual motion had also been modified in order to better capture the intent of the proposers that students not suffer any academic penalty for their participation in the Day of Action. Mr. Scully was sympathetic to the motion; however, he found its intent clearer in the original

wording. What was "amnesty" intended to mean in this context? Ms. Galarneau responded that she and the seconder would be happy to stick with the original motion if members understood it to mean that no academic penalty would be imposed on students who missed class because of the Day of Action between 12:00 noon and 5:00 p.m. on February 6th.

Mr. Fraser asked the mover and seconder to further clarify their intent. They were now asking for amnesty, but the motion circulated had referred to "reasonable accommodation", which was not the same. It had read: "Be it resolved that the Dalhousie Senate hereby requests that all individuals involved in teaching at Dalhousie on February 6, 2002, from 12:00 to 5:00, make all reasonable accommodations to allow students who wish to participate in the province-wide Day of Action to do so without academic penalty due to their absence."

Mr. Ugursal suggested that the removal of "make all reasonable accommodations to" would make the motion both clearer and stronger. Mr. Scully pointed out that the suggested amendment was ambiguous in that it both requested and mandated the course of action. The mover and seconder agreed to change the motion to read:

Be it resolved that the Dalhousie Senate hereby requests all individuals involved in teaching at Dalhousie on February 6, 2002, from 12:00 to 5:00, to allow students who wish to participate in the province-wide Day of Action to do so without academic penalty due to their absence.

Senators agreed that non-Senators be allowed to address the meeting.

Ms. Shana McGuire, President of the Dalhousie Association of Graduate Students (DAGS), asked whether the motion would apply to graduate students teaching classes. In response to further questioning by Mr. Slonim, Mr. Fraser clarified that the motion related to graduate students in their role as students, not as instructors.

Mr. Traves asked whether those participating in the Day of Action were making a particular request of the Government. Was there a specific position on tuition fees? He also wondered whether Senate was being asked to mandate that no academic penalties be imposed. Was the motion suggesting that all classes be cancelled?

Ms. Galarneau responded that the DSU was endorsing reinvestment in education, not a tuition freeze. As for the intent of the motion, it was not asking that classes be cancelled. Students would still have the opportunity to attend class, if that was their wish. The movers were asking, however, that Senate endorse the position that no academic penalty be assigned to those who wished to participate in the Day of Action. This would mean that the decision was not being made by the individual instructor.

Mr. Whyte asked that the first "Whereas" be changed to read: "Whereas students in this province are concerned about the Nova Scotia Government's failure to adequately invest in post-secondary education". That would remove the sense of culpability which the word "neglect" seemed to

imply, but maintain the focus on the inadequacy of government support. Given the publicity the motion would receive, the preamble needed to strike the right tone. Members agreed to this change.

Ms. McIntyre supported the initiative being taken by the students, but requested further clarification. Wednesday was a prime time for clinical teaching within her Faculty. She interpreted the motion as meaning that students were not excused from necessary work, simply extended the opportunity to make it up, if that was possible. Some clinical opportunities could not be replicated, however. In those circumstances students would not have the opportunity to make up for lost learning time.

Mr. Tracey believed the motion accommodated Ms. McIntyre's concerns. Students were not asking that they not have to write tests or attend clinics, but that they be given all reasonable accommodations to enable them to make up for work they missed because of the Day of Action. Some student nurses with whom he had spoken, for example, had indicated they wished to attend clinics on the afternoon of February 6th. That was the individual choice of the student.

Mr. Emodi spoke in favour of the motion. He had asked all members of the Faculty of Architecture and Planning for their feedback, and all responses had been favourable. Mr. Jalilvand reported that the Faculty of Management also supported the Day of Action. Given the importance of the motion, he wished assurance that the numbers had been verified. Mr. Tracey responded that the 126.2% was the simple percentage increase in tuition from 1991 to 2001. The approximately \$20 million represented the amount of the provincial grant in 1991 after it had been put through the Bank of Canada's inflation calculator. The 511 fewer full-time faculty came from Statistics Canada.

Ms. McGuire expressed the graduate students' support for the motion. DAGS was currently conducting a survey of Dalhousie graduate students, and one issue being addressed was student debt, a particularly serious problem for graduate students, many of whom had spent or expected to spend five to ten years in post-secondary education. Given their debt loads, tuition increases and cuts to education hit graduate students very hard.

As seconder of the motion, Mr. McGrath was confident that all members could support its spirit. All shared the goals of the students: to see a reinvestment in post-secondary education that could address problems which had escalated over the past 10 years, as numerous faculty positions had been cut and provincial grants to Dalhousie had been cut dramatically. Students across Nova Scotia believed they had to make a clear and unanimous statement to the Provincial Government. He asked that this Senate send a unanimous message to the Nova Scotia government by granting academic amnesty to all students who wished to participate in the Day of Action.

Mr. Saunders saw a big difference between telling faculty members that they were not to penalize students and requesting that they make all reasonable accommodation. This needed to be clear since some members might choose to continue with a test.

The Secretary read the motion, incorporating the agreed changes in wording:

Be it resolved that the Dalhousie Senate hereby requests all individuals involved in teaching at Dalhousie on February 6, 2002, from 12:00 to 5:00, to allow students who wish to participate in the province-wide Day of Action to do so without academic penalty due to their absence.

The motion was **CARRIED** unanimously.

2002:017.

Question Period

Mr. Bradfield had noticed that the donors' board in the new FASS building made no mention of the contributors to the Dalhousie Pension Fund which had put approximately \$5 million of employees' money into construction of that building. Another \$2 million had gone into the Computer Science Building. The Pension Fund surplus had led to the Pension holiday which in turn had allowed the University to eliminate its debt. The University had then embarked on construction of two buildings which had both run over budget. Would the employees' donations which had helped meet those overruns be recognized?

Mr. Traves agreed to report back to Senate on this matter, but he thought Mr. Bradfield's contention that the Computer Science building had been over budget might be based on financial reports carried in one of the salacious local media outlets. Mr. Slonim agreed with Mr. Traves that the Computer Science building had not been over budget. Mr. Bradfield responded that as a member of the Board of Governors' Operations Committee he had been present when motions concerning funding arrangements for the buildings had been considered.

Mr. Neumann cautioned that the Provincial Government might dismiss the statistics concerning the levels of operating grants per dollar paid by students for two reasons. It might argue that the Government was responsible for the level of grants to Universities, but not for tuition rates. The Government and the Department of Education might also argue that Nova Scotia Universities had a high rate of students coming from out of province. The numbers could be made more convincing if they were based on operating grants per Nova Scotia resident enrolled in Nova Scotia Universities. Mr. Traves accepted the logic behind Mr. Neumann's suggestion, but noted that all provinces enrolled students from out-of-province in their post-secondary institutions. The calculation proposed would also be inappropriate, given the importance that the Nova Scotia Government, and Dalhousie University, attached to students from other provinces.

Ms. Savoy asked how much progress had been made toward standardizing the visual presentation of Dalhousie. Athletics and Recreational Services had made important changes in this area. What about other units? Mr. Traves reported that the Public Relations initiative to develop a consistent visual representation continued across campus. Units had been allowed a transition period during which they could use up existing stock.

2002:018.
BAC Report XXII

Mr. Fraser welcomed Ms. Joan Conrod, Chair of the Budget Advisory Committee(BAC), and invited her to speak to the BAC Report XXII.

Ms. Conrod thanked the members of BAC for the hard work which they put into consideration of very difficult issues: Mr. Amyotte, Faculty of Engineering; Mr. Cunningham, Faculty of Dentistry; Mr. Mason, Vice-President Finance & Administration; Mr. Roughneen, Assistant Vice-President Personnel Services; Mr. Scully, Vice-President Academic & Provost; Mr. Slonim, Dean of Computer Science; Mr. Cunningham, Faculty of Dentistry; Brian Christie, Executive Director, Institutional Affairs; student representative, Ken Rehman. and staff members Ian Nason and Susan Zinck from Financial Services.

Ms. Conrod explained that the BAC XXII Report was the precursor to the budget for the upcoming year. Members who had reviewed the Report would appreciate that the budget would be grim. The majority of the University's funding came from government grants which had shrunk in both nominal and constant dollars over the last 10 years. While the amount of the provincial grant for the coming year remained unclear, the Department of Education and the Minister of Education had warned that additional funding for Universities was unlikely. The budget scenarios were based on no increase to the grant and a very optimistic 2% increase. Tuition revenue would be determined by the number of students and the tuition rate. At their press conference the previous week, the Presidents of the Nova Scotia Universities had indicated that to make up the anticipated shortfall in revenues, by depending only on tuition increases and no increase in the operating grant, would require an increase in tuition rates of 14%. The University could not be certain that the current year's 7.4% increase in students would be maintained. BAC's budget projections were based on the optimistic assumption that it would be sustained. But she underlined that their assumption was optimistic. In the third area of revenue, the Endowment, the BAC had budgeted for a 2.2% increase in spending, and for new endowment spending resulting from the Capital Campaign. However, the impact of lower interest rates had to be considered.

In the area of spending, Ms. Conrod reported that the BAC had not attempted to project the impact of the results of collective bargaining; however, step and C.D.I. increases alone would add an additional \$2 million to expenditures. If the latest Board offer was factored in, the final calculation was -\$8 million.

Attempting to balance budget cuts against tuition increases was painful for BAC members and would be painful for the University as a whole. The budget unit cuts had been offset to some extent by the ability of Faculties to generate alternative sources of funding, through ERBA and outside contract research, for example. But the final picture for the coming year was discouraging. Was it possible to break away from the pattern of tuition increases and cuts to units?

Ms. Conrod reminded members that Senate was charged with establishing the academic priorities for the University, and she encouraged Senators to engage in serious debate on the issues surrounding budgeting and academic programs. Re-inventing Dalhousie had been an initiative undertaken by the late Chair of Senate, Mr. Ken Dunn, a number of years previous. That effort at strategic planning had been derailed by the provincial rationalization process; however, Ms. Conrod believed that Senate should be engaged in an on-going debate over budgeting and academic programming. She repeated the request she had made in the past to Senate, SAPBC, Senate Officers, the Council of Deans, and any group with whom she had had the opportunity to meet: could any individual or group identify how the University community was to wrestle with the types of difficult and fundamental questions which always surfaced during discussion of the BAC Reports.

Mr. McGrath was concerned about the level of support for Student Services and student counselling and asked for greater detail concerning the expenditure of the unanticipated additional tuition revenue generated in the current year. Ms. Conrod explained that typically in the past BAC had not recommended how budgetary surpluses should be spent. The President and the Board of Governors decided on such expenditures.

Mr. Traves reiterated the points he had made at the previous meeting of Senate. From 50% to 66% of the money would be used to help meet a number of current in-year budget requirements such as the renovation of the residence at Gerard Hall; the shortfall from interest income; additional funding needed for enrolment management; and additional expenditures related to the new FASS building. He anticipated that at the end of the year approximately \$1 million would remain for one-time use. Once the BAC's final proposals were available, the President would consider carefully the option of using that money to temporarily assist in offsetting the impact of some of the budget cuts and tuition increases that might be recommended. Assuming that enrolments did not drop, that increased tuition income would be passed on to the Faculties, as students continued into the second and subsequent years of their programs.

Mr. Whyte recalled that the BAC Report's brief reference to student debt had been to the effect that they had considered the issue. He requested that BAC provide an Appendix which set out the magnitude and implications of the problem. Dalhousie was floating on a sea of student debt. The average medical student, for example, was in debt from \$25,000 to \$50,000, and those who required assistance carried an average debt load of \$80,000, and sometimes as much as \$120,000, equivalent to a small mortgage. Presumably those not requesting assistance were receiving it from parents who were going into debt to finance their children's education. He also recalled the announcement of the previous year that the Royal Bank would be refusing to extend loans to some students. Senate needed to be reassured that the BAC was analyzing the implications of student debt on the University and on the nature of the students who could afford to come here. Ms. Conrod agreed that the BAC would attempt to prepare such an Appendix.

Mr. Whyte also wondered whether the low interest rates which had contributed to the decrease in endowment incomes had benefitted the University's budget in another area. Ms. Conrad

responded that most of the University's borrowing was mortgage-backed financing on facilities such as residences, and those rates had not been as seriously affected. Overall the University was not a borrower, though the budget of the Provincial Government might have benefitted in some areas from the fall in interest rates.

Ms. Binkley noted that those Faculties which had increased their enrolments during the current year had incurred considerable debt in the process. FASS, for example, had spent upwards of \$600,000 for additional services for students, which had created a shortfall of at least \$200,000. In 2002-2003, the Faculty would need to use ERBA monies to make up for the expenditures of 2001-2002; to cover further expenditures necessitated by the anticipated further increase in enrolments; and to meet budget cuts. She suggested consideration be given to forgiving the loans incurred in the current year, and she spoke strongly against differential cuts based on the misconception that some Faculties had benefitted financially from increased enrolments.

Ms. Corke asked members to consider student debt in a broad context which included the junior faculty members at Dalhousie, most of whom had monthly payments of between \$200 and \$600 on their student loans. Their salaries made it impossible for many to make those payments.

Mr. Bradfield noted that the \$3.5 million in increased tuition revenue became \$3.9 million once the foreign student differential was factored in. He recalled that the last time student enrolments had gone up unexpectedly some of the resulting increased revenue had been reallocated to the Faculty of Computer Science where much of the increase had occurred. This suggested there was a precedent for what Ms. Binkley was requesting.

On another item, Mr. Bradfield noted that the SAPBC had been told that funds for Canada Research Chairs were not included in the BAC figures because they were a "flow-through"; appointing a new CRC increased revenues and expenses. Mr. Bradfield thought this need not be the case, even for a new appointment, because some of the funds could be used for research expenses that otherwise would be paid out of the regular budget. In addition, internal CRC appointments represented a net improvement in the budget for the same reason, but more particularly because the CRC funding for internal appointments covered salary costs currently in the budget. He had calculated the salaries for the seven approved internal CRC appointments at \$758,579 and for the four submitted at \$296,786, a total of \$1,055,365. Another 18 CRCs were allocated for Dalhousie up to and including 2002. To the extent that these were internal appointments, further salary savings would be generated.

Mr. Bradfield also noted that the Administration intended to levy an overhead charge to CRC grants. The grants currently approved were \$1.2 million per year, the submitted were \$.6 million, and the allocated were worth another \$2.6 million, for a total of \$4.4 million. How much revenue would be generated as overhead charges against these funds?

On a general note, Mr. Bradfield observed that the BAC XXII Report did not cover the entire budget. For instance, Ancillaries were reported as a null figure in the BAC data as they were supposed to break even. However, at p.16 the Report cited the \$450,000 spent on Gerard Hall as

a possible use of some of the \$3.5 million in unanticipated tuition revenues for 2001-2002 even though this was contrary to CAUBO conventions. Mr. Bradfield asked what the total budget for the university was projected to be.

Ms. Conrod found it unfortunate that the budget debates often went down this road. The BAC dealt with the Operating Budget, with the continuing funds, not one-time funds, with the specific definitions of sources and uses of funds as set out in the Report. That seemed appropriate. BAC's conservative approach also seemed appropriate for an organization which had dealt with a \$38 million budget deficit in its recent history. Any good news tended to appear in the budget a year late. The operating surplus for this year could be dealt with once the money was in the bank. The impact of the CRC Chairs would become clearer as the program unfolded. In some instances the chairs would be a liability to those departments in which they were housed, as the additional research infrastructure had to be provided to the CRC holders. In other cases, those in which existing faculty members' salaries were freed up, the members would need to be replaced; and CRC agreements stipulated that freed up money could not simply be pulled from a unit and redirected. The point of CRC funding was to strengthen the University's program in specific areas. In general, the University community needed to be patient when dealing with government programs.

Mr. Scully noted that the Ancillary Services had not run into problems, but had responded to an unanticipated growth in the student population. It seemed appropriate that some of the increased tuition revenues be allocated to the non-academic unit which had incurred costs in attempting to accommodate additional students.

Mr. Jalilvand reiterated Ms. Conrod's concerns that the University find a new way to approach revenues and expenditures, given that it was unlikely that provincial funding would increase in the near future. Cuts would continue, with serious implications for academic and non-academic units and for students. He proposed that Senate, as the highest academic governing body, create an academic and financial model which would enable the University to confront both short-term and long-term problems. Dalhousie's reputation and the quality of its research, and teaching would be in jeopardy unless Senate struggled with these issues. Ms. Bleasdale agreed, and noted that SAPBC had agreed to encourage debate in the areas of concern to Mr. Jalilvand and Ms. Conrod.

Mr. Fraser thanked the members of BAC and Senators for their contributions to the discussion. The issues raised represented an enormous challenge, one that required attention not just from SAPBC, which had specific responsibilities in the area of academic planning and budgeting. He asked all members to consider and suggest ways of proceeding.

2002:019.

Status of the School of Biomedical Engineering

Mr. Fraser explained that some confusion had surrounded the status of the School of Biomedical

Engineering. SAPBC had met with the appropriate individuals and he was happy to report that the resulting clarification was satisfactory to all concerned. The School of Biomedical Engineering had a unique structure within the University in that it was fully a part of both the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Engineering, with the responsibilities and privileges that went with that dual status. The implication for program initiatives was that since the Ph.D. program in the Faculty of Engineering was not discipline-based, but was offered through Graduate Studies on a Faculty-wide basis, the Ph.D. in Biomedical Engineering would also be Faculty-based, within the Faculty of Engineering. The relevant excerpts from minutes of SAPBC would elaborate on this. They would be available once they had been approved.

Mr. Fraser highlighted two aspects of SAPBC's deliberations which had important general implications for the University. Firstly, within Dalhousie there were two different models for a Ph.D., one discipline-based and the other Faculty-based. The advantages and disadvantages of each model warranted further examination. Secondly, while the organizational structure of the School of Biomedical Engineering was unique, it might serve as a valuable model, particularly for the organization of interdisciplinary initiatives.

2002:020.

Master of Health Informatics

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Fraser moved:

That the proposed Master of Health Informatics be approved, with the new program being included in the Enrolment Related Budget Allocation (ERBA) calculation, and with the program making a one-time transfer of \$2,850 to the Library in 2001-2002, and a base-budget transfer of \$3,210 to the Library beginning in 2002-2003.

Ms. Bleasdale asked members to share with Senate their support for the proposed program.

Ms. McIntyre congratulated the proposers on completing what had been a very labour-intensive process and on providing an excellent proposal. She noted that SAPBC had expressed its desire that the Faculty of Health Professions become more involved in the program. Ms. McIntyre had written a very strong letter of support for this initiative, and she was happy to report that the Faculty would be increasingly involved. At the moment it was a question of capacity, not will. Hopefully a number of graduates of the Health Information Management program would pursue the Masters in Health Informatics. In the interests of clarity, and to underline the difference between the proposed program and the one currently offered by the Faculty of Health Professions, Ms. McIntyre asked that the references in the proposal to the latter be corrected to read Bachelor of Health Information Management.

Mr. Kwak spoke to the extensive review process undertaken by the Faculty of Graduate Studies. The two external reviewers, one Canadian and one American, had each written very favourably about the program. It was important to note that this was the first program of its kind in Canada,

and one that would supply much-needed graduates to the health research community. Mr. Kwak complemented the Faculties of Computer Science and Medicine, as well as the Faculties of Management and Health Professions which had cooperated extensively to make the program possible.

Mr. Jalilvand noted that the Faculty of Management had been involved at various stages in developing the program. The program was particularly welcome to Management as it would dovetail with the Faculty's development of the Centre of Excellence in Management Informatics. Together, the program and Centre would give Dalhousie a very strong position in the field of Informatics.

Mr. Slonim thanked everyone for their assistance, but in particular wished to acknowledge the work of Michael Shepherd and David Zitner who had laboured for 18 months to create this unique opportunity.

Given the innovative nature of the program, Mr. Neumann wondered how the proposers had reached the conclusion that it would attract 30 new students each year. Mr. Slonim responded that detailed planning and advertising were crucial to this type of venture. He gave the example of the Masters of Electronic Commerce degree. Proposers of that program had hoped to attract 30 students at the outset. In the past year the program had had 47 students, not including the Executive Branch. Mr. Slonim cautioned that growth of this type of program needed to be controlled to ensure that the financial resources were available to maintain quality.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Fraser congratulated all those who had worked on the proposal.

2002:021.

President's Report

Mr. Traves spoke to the University budget. He trusted members of Senate had seen the document presented at the end of the previous week by the Presidents of the Nova Scotia Universities to the Provincial Government. Financial data on levels of government funding and tuition levels from province to province had accompanied that document. Costs were rising across the province and unless the Government increased its funding Universities faced the prospect of cutting budgets and raising tuition significantly. The University Presidents were asking the Provincial Government to make post-secondary education a greater priority. Mr. Traves hoped that their submission, together with the students' Day of Action and other initiatives by other groups and individuals, would have some impact. But he thought members needed to understand that even with relief from the Provincial Government, which struck him as doubtful, the University would face a difficult year.

Mr. Traves thought that the curious financial situation facing Dalhousie was frequently confusing. As members found themselves becoming emotional about budget matters, they

needed to return to what he would characterise as two budget impulses at the University. One was the good news aspect of funding and budgeting. A number of recent programs and projects had been facilitated by designated external funds. These included monies designated by a donor for a particular purpose and government programs such as the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) which tied funding to specific projects. In addition, there were longer-term projects such as the Canada Research Chairs (CRC). The CRC program allowed for the hiring of professors and the funding of their research for a number of years; however, the University was required to utilize the available money to support the professors' research, directly and indirectly. The University had considerable latitude as to the assigning of Chairs. But once a Chair had been assigned, the agreement was that any freed up money had to go towards strengthening that area of research. In instances in which a Chair was appointed internally, Dalhousie was required to channel the salary freed up back into the appointee's research area, by making another appointment in that area, for example.

The second budget impulse was the bad news. Government grants and tuition revenues had not been keeping up with rising costs. Consequently the University had been faced with budget cuts each year which meant that Faculties had had to reduce their number of appointments and scale back their plans, while at the same time the basic operating budget of the University had come under enormous pressure.

As individuals became upset about the consequences of budget cuts, Mr. Traves hoped they would not be misled concerning the resources available to the University. There were two pools of money, controlled by two different sets of rules.

2002:022.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.