

Item: Senate Minutes, April 2004
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for April 2004. 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, April 12, 2004 at 4:00 p.m., in the University Hall, MacDonald Building.

Present with Mr. M. El-Hawary in the chair were the following: Barkow, Breckenridge, Butler, Caley, Carroll, Cercone, Cochrane, Cook, Corke, Dunphy, Farrell, Finbow, Fraser (Recording Secretary), Hamilton, Hicks, Jalilvand, Jost, Kwak, Lahey, Livingston, Maes, McGrath, McIntyre, McMullen, McNeil, Murphy, Opong, Pelzer, Pronk, Satish, Schroeder, Scrimger, Scully, Stone, Stroink, Stuttard, Taylor, Traves, Wanzel, Wasko, Zuck.

Regrets: Barker, Beazley, Coughlan, Das Gupta, Finley, Leonard, Phillips, Richard, Russell, Sommerfeld

Absent: Barnes, Ben-Abdullah, Earl, Elliott, Grantmyre, Guy, Horackova, Loudon, MacDonald, Macrae, Meagher-Stewart, Morgunov, Neumann, Partridge, Precious, Rajora, Rathwell, Taheri, Whyte, Zalezsak,

Invitees in attendance: P. Amyotte, C. Gallant, R. Klapstein, C. MacLean, A. Power, S. Zinck

2004:023

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was ADOPTED as circulated.

2004:024

Draft Minutes of Previous Meeting

i) Approval

The minutes of the meeting of March 8, 2004 were ADOPTED as corrected.

ii) Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

2004:025

Chair's Remarks

Mr. El-Hawary reported that :

- On December 17, 2003, the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC) had approved the following programs:
 - Bachelor of Engineering in Environmental Engineering
 - Bachelor of Science Combined Honours in Earth Science and Oceanography
 - Bachelor of Science Combined Honours in Chemistry and Oceanography
 - Bachelor of Science Combined Honours in Maritime Biology and Oceanography.

- On March 29, 2004, proposals for the Bachelor of Arts with Combined Honours and Double Major in Canadian Studies and Bachelor of Science with Minor in Canadian Studies, were forwarded to the MPHEC with positive commendations from Mr. Scully, Vice President Academic.

- On April 5, 2004, the MPHEC had approved the following programs:
 - PhD in Biomedical Engineering
 - Bachelor of Science (Health Promotion)
 - Bachelor of Arts in European Studies

Mr. El-Hawary stated that a report on the terms of employment for non-unionized faculty members would be forthcoming from Vice-President Scully in late spring or early summer.

2004:026

Report on Research and Innovation at Dalhousie: Successes and Challenges

Mr. El-Hawary invited Mr. Breckenridge, Vice-President Research to address the Senate.

Mr. Breckenridge referred Senators to the available paper copies of his *Power Point* presentation. Mr. Breckenridge described research at Dalhousie and affiliated teaching hospitals as encompassing 11 faculties, 95 academic units, over 1500 full and part-time faculty members, approximately 3000 graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and approximately 1000 research technicians, research associates, and research nurse coordinators. Research activities were carried out by single investigators with students and/or research technicians/ associates; within research groups amongst investigators with a common interest; and within interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary collaborating groups and networks, both within the University and across universities. He noted that increased emphasis by granting agencies had been placed on funding collaborative research.

Mr. Breckenridge summarized the total amounts in funding received over the last three years, noting significant increases in funding from the federal government through the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, and from the provincial government through the Nova Scotia Health Research Foundation and the Nova Scotia Research and Innovation Trust. He added that the Canada Research Chairs programme had contributed significant support to research in 2002-03. Overall, the total of research grants in 2000-2001 was \$41.3 million and in 2002-03, \$55.6 million. In terms of research contracts and clinical trial research, activity was reported as being relatively stable, with \$10.3 million in 2000-2001 and \$9.6 million in 2002-03. Mr. Breckenridge noted that over the past five years, total research funding to the University had risen from approximately \$50 million in 1998-99 to \$75-80 million in 2003, with the expected amounts for 2003-04 to be in the vicinity of \$80 million. In addition, there had been a 45% increase in approved research grants while the number of clinical trials remained constant and the number of research contracts decreased slightly. He stated that these results only referred to the number

of successful research grants, with the number of grant applications being processed through the Research Office being quite significantly higher.

Mr. Breckenridge noted that major areas of research strength in the University were health studies, ocean studies, materials science, information and communication technology, oil and gas/energy, and arts and culture. He summarized four points related to building further capacity for research as follows:

- Through the Canadian Foundation for Innovation through the New Opportunities program which had enabled infrastructure support for new faculty, noting a 95% success rate in these applications; and the Innovation Fund, which had been less successful in terms of applications in excess of projects in the \$4-5 million range;
- Capacity for further research based on previous funded amounts such as the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (\$24M); Nova Scotia Research and Innovation Trust (\$10M); Canada Research Chairs (\$3.5 M/y); Atlantic Innovation Fund (I & II) (\$29M), and “In Kind” software - Pace (\$61 M) and Schlumberger (\$16 M);
- Since 2000, there was successful recruitment of 50 new faculty with development of infrastructure support funding (\$20 M) through for example, CFI and NSRIT, and the recruitment and retention of 25 outstanding research faculty through the Canada Research Chairs programme (\$8.5M). Highlights of successful research initiatives were noted through examples in Computer Science, the Marine Environmental Prediction System, Materials Science, Advanced Systems for Infrastructure Health Monitoring, the Metropolis Project, Genomics, and Neuroimaging/ Brain Repair;
- Plans were in place for building capacity for future research, noting additional research space at the IWK Health Centre (CFI), the development of strategic research initiatives related to oil and gas/energy, ocean sciences and cancer research, and further expansion of the neuroscience/brain repair initiative.

Mr. Breckenridge summarized the challenges to continued research capacity in terms of the changing approaches by governments in terms of increased emphasis on outcomes, deliverables, knowledge translation and commercialization of intellectual property arising from research; increased limitation of flexible use of funds; partnering initiatives requiring involvement of provinces; provincial concern about the partnering in federal initiatives and need to establish priorities; and the development of large scale network projects requiring dedicated knowledgeable staff to assist researchers in the preparation of initiatives.

Mr. Breckenridge commented on the perspective of granting agencies as related to innovation leading to discoveries and new ideas for the benefit of Canadians through translation of research and described successful examples of effective translation of research initiatives at Dalhousie. He briefly described examples of successful industry liaison research partnerships. Finally, he commented on the commercialization of research, that is providing benefits to society through commercial development of intellectual property generated during fundamental research. He noted issues related to the designation of intellectual property (IP) and disclosure policies, and provided examples of successful commercialization of research initiative outcomes. He identified ongoing challenges as the education of researchers regarding IP, adequate funding for technology transfer offices, expansion of proof of principle funds,

effective assessment of commercial potential and marketing of IP, improved business liaison for development of IP, adequate management of spin-off companies, and early stage venture capital funding. He noted that efforts were under way to develop networks of University commercialization offices in the Atlantic provinces and of industrial liaison officers to facilitate collaboration of researchers with industry.

He concluded by noting the significant research productivity and research capacity building at Dalhousie adding that a future emphasis would be on the need for increased knowledge translation.

Mr. Stuttard inquired as to the definition of the disclosure policy. Mr. Breckenridge responded that it was the intent to commercialize or to develop intellectual property, noting that there is no such policy at Dalhousie at the current time.

2004:027

Question Period

Mr. Cercone inquired as to why some Dalhousie e-mail addresses for students have been depersonalized, that is have been assigned numbers rather than a name. Mr. Scully stated he would investigate and report back to Senate.

2004:028

Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee: Approval of the Norman Newman Centre for Entrepreneurship (Faculty of Management)

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

THAT the Senate approve the proposal for the formation of the Norman Newman Centre for Entrepreneurship.

Mr. El-Hawary invited Mr. Jalilvand, Dean of the Faculty of Management, and Mr. Klapstein of the School of Business Administration to comment on the proposal. Mr. Jalilvand noted that the proposed Centre is one of three planned for the Faculty of Management with the first, the Royal Bank Centre for Risk Management having been established in 2003, and a third in Management Informatics currently under development. He noted the connection between the intent of the Centre and previous presentation by Mr. Breckenridge regarding the commercialization of research productivity. He commented on the significant financial contributions of the Newman Family to the Faculty of Management through scholarships and more recently through a donation of \$1 million for a dedicated space in the new Faculty of Management building, that would house the Centre for Entrepreneurship. Mr. Klapstein stated that the Centre would enable greater collaboration on issues related to entrepreneurship within the Faculty of Management and with other Faculties, particularly Computer Science, Engineering and Science.

Mr. Farrell questioned if as noted in the Library assessment, only 60% of the available literature on entrepreneurship was adequate. Mr. Klapstein responded that the current facilities were adequate for the start-up of the Centre with the expectations that further resources will be sought as the Centre becomes active, with internet sources being used to capacity. Mr. Maes noted that most of the material, if not readily available in the Library would be available through Document Delivery within a reasonable time frame.

Mr. Murphy asked about the roles of the two Advisory Councils to be established for the Centre, wondering why there were two rather than one combined advisory committee. Mr. Klapstein replied that one would have research and academic foci, and the other would focus input from the business community and expertise external to the University, and that having separate councils would enable more productivity in each realm.

The motion was CARRIED.

2004:029

Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Report XXIX: An Operating Budget Plan for 2004-05

Mr. El-Hawary welcomed members of the BAC who were in attendance - Chris Gallant, Paul Amyotte, Susan Zinck and Jan Kwak, and invited the Chair of the BAC, Mr. Scully to present the BAC Report XXIX, copies of which had been circulated with the meeting agenda.

Using a *Power Point* presentation, Mr. Scully summarized the salient points in the budget planning process and highlighted differences from the previous year. He noted that the budget did not include revenue and expenses from research grants/contracts (approximately \$80M) or ancillaries such as for building construction (approximately \$30M), adding that the Operating Budget consumed approximately two-thirds of revenue and expenditures. He described the assumptions underpinning the amount assigned to the Government operating grant given that a final determination of that amount had yet to be announced.

The points made by Mr. Scully in terms of strategies to maintain a balanced budget for 2004–05 to achieve the goal of a balanced budget of \$214M (reflecting an increase of 6% over 2003-04), included:

- an assumed increase in government funding of approximately 1% over the 2003-04 budget;
- tuition fee revenue from the enrollment increase of 600 new students;
- a 7.25% general increase in tuition fees for all programs plus a \$330 International student differential fee increase and an additional increase of \$500 for students in MD, DDS, MD/MSc programs;
- increase of \$10 per term in the Facilities Renewal fee for full-time students and \$5 per term for part-time students;
- no increase in endowment income or expenditure for established endowments;
- cuts to Faculties' budgets of 1.9% and to other units of .33% for a total of \$2.8M

Strategies for achieving the BAC goal of maintaining investment in strategic expenditures included:

- student assistance budget increased by 7.0% (~\$750,000)
- Library collections budget by 5.9% (~\$300,000)
- facilities renewal budget increased by 40% (~\$1M)

Mr. Scully invited questions in response to his presentation. Mr. Farrell commented regarding differential fees for international students, of the need to take into account more of the actual costs of recruiting, supporting and maintaining international students. Mr Scully agreed that such costs were currently borne disproportionately by some Faculties and stated that those issues would be part of a campus wide discussion over the next year.

Mr. Cercone inquired as to whether the budget planning process might not be more transparent. Mr.

Scully responded that Dalhousie functioned as a de-centralized institution with key decisions on budget being made at the larger administrative unit level and with academic decisions made at the Faculty level. He added that if the process was more open, there likely would continue to be questions of transparency, including a lack of transparency within the Faculty level.

Mr. Stroink inquired if the budget item for recruitment had been increased over 2003-04. Mr. Scully responded that the allocation for enrollment management would continue at \$250,000. Mr. McGrath commented that given the tuition increase, accessibility to Dalhousie would be impacted. He suggested that, should increased government funding be made available, it be applied to the tuition fee and differential fee increases. Ms. Stone supported the point of the likelihood of decreased accessibility, and wondered if information could be made available on the costs of students per program across universities. Mr. Scully responded that the information could likely be obtained but not easily and he wondered how useful it would be in terms of decision-making. Ms. Stone suggested that the information might help determine whether tuition fees per program should reflect the actual costs of that program, rather than a portion of costs spread over all programs.

Mr. Jalilvand commented that as government funding for the future would likely continue to be unknown, and that enrollment would likely begin to decline over the next few years, that cuts to budgets would pose serious problems for Faculties. He asked if the University would be able to predict sustainability over the next three to four years. Mr. Scully responded that in the long-term, the current approach would not produce sustainability. He added that in terms of aggregates, the ERBA increase to Faculties closely offset the aggregate cut to Faculties, with the Faculty of Medicine losing most. However, every Faculty's budget in the end would be larger than that for 2003-04, due to the compensation increases that would be added and a part of the overall 6% budget increase.

Mr. McGrath suggested that the recommendation from the Dalhousie Student Union of a joint management and bargaining unit committee to provide a financial assessment of the realities facing the University in the context of the framework of up-coming negotiations between the University and the Dalhousie Faculty Association (DFA). Mr. Traves responded that the recommendation would be considered but noted that there were other bodies within the University that would need consideration and were affected by the budget, in addition to the DFA. He suggested that it might be helpful to distribute widely across campus at the end of each fiscal year, a report prepared for the Board of Governors on the financial situation of the University. He added that input on the budget process was sought from all parts of the University rather than from any body in particular as all were impacted. Mr. McGrath followed-up by noting that he was referring in his comments to all bargaining groups rather than only the DFA.

Mr. El-Hawary concluded the discussion by noting that the BAC would appreciate comments from across the University within the next 10 days if possible.

2004:030

Senate Steering Committee: Process re: Approval of Graduands

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

THAT the appropriate Dean or the Provost of the College of Arts and Science, together with the University Registrar and the Chair of Senate (or designate), be authorized, in the

name of Senate, to approve the awarding of degrees and diplomas prior to scheduled convocation ceremonies, to all candidates identified in correspondence to the Secretary of Senate, and the Chair of Senate shall report the approved lists of degrees to the Senate at its next meeting following such convocation ceremonies.

The motion was CARRIED.

Mr. Fraser inquired as to when this motion would take effect, suggesting it be the Fall convocation. Mr. Traves commented that it could be implemented for Spring 2004, suggesting that the assembly could take a “straw” vote on the matter. The assembly agreed that the process would take effectively immediately. Mr. Fraser reminded the assembly that the scheduled meeting of Senate for May 20, 2004 at 10AM would be held to address agenda items other than the traditional approval of graduands.

2004:031

Senate Library Committee Annual Report: 2002-03

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

THAT the Senate adopt the Senate Library Committee 2002-2003 Annual Report.

Mr. El-Hawary invited Colin MacLean, Chair of the Senate Library Committee to present the report. Mr. MacLean invited questions. Mr. McNeil inquired about the state of the microfilm readers and printers given the current poor state of this equipment. Mr. MacLean responded that the matter had not been part of discussion in the 2002-03 year but would be considered within the current year. Mr. McIntyre commented on the usefulness of the format of the Report and inquired about the Library’s continued participation in the Canadian National Site Licensing Project (CNSLP). Mr. Maes responded that subsequent to the Report of 2002-03, during the 2003-04 year negotiations for continuing the licencing agreement for a further three years were successful, resulting in yearly price increases of four per cent versus the anticipated 12-14%. Dalhousie participated in the CNSLP agreement with 64 other universities across Canada.

The motion was CARRIED.

2004:032

President’s Report

- Mr. Traves commented that in terms of the BAC XXIX Report, the issue of sustainability of the University in its current configuration had been raised at the Board of Governors, and would likely be part of on-going discussions.
- Mr. Traves stated that negotiations with the Dalhousie Faculty Association would begin formally in the very near future. Negotiations with the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) which represented teaching assistants and part-time faculty members had proceeded through conciliation with all issues regarding salary increases and contract language regarding part-time faculty members being agreed with no outstanding issues remaining. In regards to the Teaching Assistant group, there continued to be disagreement on salary. The conciliator had filed his report with a strike date possible by April 22, 2004. Mr. Traves hoped that, given the strike date

was three days prior to the end of the examination period, that any impact would be kept to a minimum.

- Mr. Traves reported that the University representatives had been meeting with members of government on a regular basis to work toward a multi-year funding agreement.

2004:033

Report of Decisions of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee

The Senate session moved *in camera* to hear a Report of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee (SAAC) decisions.

When Senate returned to open session, Mr. El-Hawary reported that the Senate, during the *in camera* session, had ratified the decisions identified in the March 16, 2004 Report of the SAAC Hearing Panel.

2004:034

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.