

Item: Senate Minutes, February 1997

Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5 Accession 2007-039 Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for February 1997. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

The original materials and additional materials which have not been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections using the call number referenced above.

In most cases, copyright is held by Dalhousie University. Some materials may be in the public domain or have copyright held by another party. It is your responsibility to ensure that you use all library materials in accordance with the Copyright Act of Canada. Please contact the Copyright Office if you have questions about copyright, fair dealing, and the public domain.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
APPROVED MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Monday, 10 February 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Adams, Andrews, Apostle, Archibald, Birdsall, Bradfield, Brett, Cameron, Camfield, Clark, Coffin, Dickson, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Kiang, Kimmins, Lee, Lovely, Lydon, MacDonald, MacInnis, MacKay, Maloney, McIntyre, Moore, Morehouse, Patriquin, Pereira, Ricketts, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Scassa, Sutherland, Taylor, Tomblin Murphy, Traves, Wrixon.

Regrets: Bleasdale, Doolittle, Klein, Morrissey, Oore, Siddiq, Starnes, White.

97:020.

Adoption of Agenda

Members agreed to agenda items 4 & 5 being orders of the day at 5:00 and 5:50 p.m., respectively. The agenda was then adopted as circulated.

97:021.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Mr. Ruedy requested the following changes in the first paragraph of 97:018, p. 5: At line 13, the sentence beginning "The teaching and research functions..." should read "Salaries of core clinical faculty are supported from two sources: partly through the University's operating budget, which totalled roughly \$8.7 million annually and partly through the contributions from the clinical earnings of individual clinical faculty members." The next sentence beginning "The latter..." should be omitted. The sentence beginning "Therefore, tenure had no meaning..." should read "Therefore, tenure carried no implication as regards security of salary for clinical faculty members."

Mr. Andrews noted that in 97:017, p. 3, 3rd paragraph: December 1 should be December 31; and Mr. Stuttard noted several other minor corrections.

The minutes of the meeting of January 27, 1997, with the noted changes, were then

approved.

97:022.

Tabled Motion from Faculty of Medicine

A motion (Lee/Dickson)

to take from the table the motion to approve the Faculty of Medicine's proposal on appointments

was CARRIED.

Ms. Fee then addressed the Senate on behalf of the DFA. Referring to a letter the DFA had forwarded to the Chair, Ms. Fee stated that the proposal of the Faculty of Medicine had far-reaching implications. While clinical faculty were not part of the DFA bargaining unit, more than 60 were members of the DFA. Therefore, the DFA was concerned that the clinical faculty should have an opportunity to express their opinions about the document. Until the last Senate meeting, however, the DFA had not been consulted about the proposal. Ms. Fee noted that the current proposal, in effect, created renewable limited term appointments allowing budget flexibility. Further, as noted in Senate's own regulations (5.2.1), tenure was the ultimate safeguard of academic freedom. Therefore, the DFA was concerned that loss of the possibility of tenure for clinical faculty would mean that the academic freedom of clinical faculty would be at risk. She concluded by suggesting that the proposal be referred to the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to review the Senate Regulations on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotions. Ms. Hobson stated that the Ad Hoc Committee is not yet a functioning committee, having met only once since its inception. Some Senators suggested that the "thin end of the wedge argument" was speculative in nature and therefore could not be reasonably debated. Others stated that the CAPR was addressing a very real problem in the Faculty of Medicine and that they were satisfied that members of the Faculty of Medicine had had adequate opportunity to discuss the issues without a generalized concern having arisen. Regarding this last point, Mr. Ruedy clarified that the current CAPR document was the third version brought forward by the clinical faculty to the full medical faculty, and the two previous versions of the current document had been unanimously passed by the Faculty Council. One precursor document had come to the Senate Steering Committee for consideration and had been referred back to the Faculty for revisions. The suggested changes had been made. Legal counsel had assisted the Faculty in bringing the current document in line with existing Senate documents. Mr. Ruedy further stated that 600 copies of the current version of the proposal had been circulated to Faculty members in January. Only 6 Faculty members (4 from 1 department and 2 from another) had responded to the mailing, largely to ask questions for clarification. Mr. Ruedy concluded that the discussion and review of CAPR had been ample and adequate. Mr. Cameron noted that section 14.1.2 of the Senate Regulations clearly states only that the President will consult with the DFA, and Senate's opinion is to be solicited. He would not be comfortable deciding what might be in the Faculty of Medicine's best interest.

Several senators expressed support for referring the proposal to the Ad Hoc Committee.

Some were concerned that removal of tenure-track appointments for clinical faculty in the Faculty of Medicine would set a dangerous precedent that might then be applied to other, analogous, groups. Mr. Hartzman elaborated by saying that he did not wish to see a situation develop in which a position that is tied to success in securing independent income would become a basis for redefining the right to tenure. He felt that the current proposal sets such a precedent. Mr. Andrews noted that the issue was complicated and there were several procedural issues in the proposal that warranted further investigation and discussion: the proposed appeals process was unsatisfactory; the intended group to which the new procedures would be applied was not clearly delineated; and the possibility that current University policy regarding adjunct appointments or application of Clause 14.16(b)(iii) of the Collective Agreement could be alternatives to the proposed changes needed consideration. Therefore, he moved (seconded by Mr. Hartzman)

That consideration of CAPR be referred to the Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Regulations.

Other senators spoke against the motion to refer, suggesting that Senate should not avoid or delay a vote on the proposal. Mr. Ruedy stated that sending it back at this point would be a serious indictment of how the Faculty of Medicine conducts business.

Mr. Wrixon wanted to state for the record that he was offended by Dr. Welch's question (posted to the Senate e-mail list during the past week's discussion of CAPR) on whether Senators from the Faculty of Medicine might have been told to remain silent on CAPR during Senate discussions.

The question was called, and the motion to refer consideration of CAPR to the Ad Hoc Committee was LOST. After further brief discussion, the question on the main motion to approve the CAPR proposal of the Faculty of Medicine was called.

The motion was CARRIED.

Mr. Andrews raised a concern that someone be responsible for ensuring that the CAPR is in line with Senate regulations. Mr. Stuttard responded that the President had now heard the opinion of Senate and, after further consultations, would be responsible for bringing a proposal to the Board of Governors to change the Senate Regulations on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion with respect to clinical medical faculty.

97:023.

Motions from Senate Steering Committee regarding Senate Membership

The time being 5:00 p.m., the Chair called for agenda item 4 to be discussed.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, the Vice-Chair of Senate moved:

That as of April 1, 1997, the membership of Senate shall be increased to include four new ex-officio members (the Deans of the Faculties of Architecture, Computer Science [when established], and Engineering, and the Principal of the "TUNS" College of Dalhousie University), and 48 elected faculty members (to be three times the total of 16 ex-officio members).

Mr. Lydon proposed an amendment to the motion stating that "whereas the Senate complement of elected faculty shall be three times the number of ex-officio members, and whereas students do not fit into either category, it is moved:

That student membership be increased to five.

In the discussion that followed, all speakers were in favour of increasing the number of student representatives to Senate. Mr. Taylor asked what student organization would represent TUNS students after the merger. Mr. Traves responded that this matter was still under discussion. He made a friendly suggestion that the question of student representation be Tabled until the student organization issues were resolved. This suggestion was supported by Mr. Andrews. Mr. Lee, however, was concerned that failure to pass the proposed amendment would send an unwarranted and unwanted negative message to the student body. Both Mr. Clark and Mr. Lydon suggested that the current amendment could accommodate any later agreement regarding which student organization would represent which students.

The question was called and the amendment was CARRIED.

Discussion returned to the main motion. Mr. Bradfield requested assurance that the proposed changes to Senate membership would not mean that faculty at TUNS would, in effect, get two votes on some issues. He also wanted assurance that the appointment and review of all ex-officio members would come under Dalhousie Senate jurisdiction. Mr. Traves assured him that Senate powers would not be delegated to the TUNS College Academic Council. He added that the role of the latter body will soon be defined and the terms of reference presented to Senate. Mr. Traves also stated that the ex-officio members of TUNS will be subject to the Senate procedures for appointment and reappointment. He added that these procedures are currently being reviewed.

Mr. Ricketts asked if the student enrolment numbers used to calculate senate seat allocations included graduate students. Mr. Stuttard replied that they did, and clarified that the numbers represented full-time equivalent students rather than head counts.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED without dissent.

The Vice-Chair of Senate moved:

That the distribution of elected Senators to Faculties (including Henson College and the Libraries) shall now be recalculated, using the existing formula, to include representatives from the existing TUNS Faculties of Architecture, Engineering, and the future amalgamated Faculty of Computer Science. The target complements of Dalhousie Faculties and the actual complements of TUNS Faculties for 1996-1997, and student enrolment figures at December 1, 1996, shall be used in the formula.

Mr. Andrews asked if the calculation for the Faculties of Engineering and Computer Science included faculty who are currently members of the Dalhousie departments who will join those Faculties following the merger. Mr. Stuttard said that they did. Mr. Pereira noted that the membership formula had been agreed upon by the previous Senate. Since the current situation was substantially changing, the balance of the University and Senate membership away from the Humanities, he asked that the formula be reviewed with the possibility that an alternative one be developed.

The question was called and the motion was CARRIED without dissent.

The Vice-Chair of Senate moved:

That elections conducted in March 1997 shall include election of new or additional members as required by the membership recalculation. Where possible, election of members from the new constituencies and new (as distinct from replacement or re-elected) members of existing constituencies shall be to one, two, or three-year terms to begin on April 1, 1997, and end on June 30, 1998, 1999 or 2000, as appropriate to provide as evenly staggered terms as possible.

Mr. Hartzman asked what would become of his position as he currently was an elected member from the Faculty of Science and after April 1 he would be a member of the Faculty of Computer Science. Mr. Kimmins stated that there was nothing in the Senate Constitution prohibiting a member of one Faculty from being elected to represent another. Mr. Andrews disagreed, stating that a member of one Faculty cannot represent another. Mr. Ruedy suggested that Senators represent the University, not the Faculty from which they are elected. Mr. Stuttard clarified that two departments (Microbiology/Immunology and Biochemistry) and their members in the Faculty of Medicine were, for academic purposes, also members of the Faculty of Science and could be elected to Senate by either constituency. He suggested that the issue of whether Mr. Hartzman would continue to represent the Faculty of Science after April 1 was a matter internal to the Faculty of Science.

The question was called and the motion was CARRIED.

The Vice-Chair of Senate moved:

That the text of the Senate Constitution be amended to reflect the changes resulting from adoption of motions 1, 2, and 3, above.

Mr. Bradfield asked that the specific text changes to the constitution be brought to Senate for discussion and final approval. Mr. Archibald clarified that the approved changes would now be put into effect and would not require further Senate approval. The Chair agreed and noted that, as requested by Mr. Andrews, editorial changes would be circulated to Senators to ensure that any errors were corrected before the revised text was printed.

The question was called and the motion was CARRIED without dissent.

97:024.

Steering Committee Nomination to Senate Nominating Committee

The Vice-Chair moved:

That Mr. Tom Boran, Faculty of Dentistry, be elected to a further term on the Senate Nominating Committee.

The motion was CARRIED.

97:025.

Atlantic Canada Universities Open Learning Accrediting Service

Given time restrictions, discussion of the Atlantic Canada Universities Open Accrediting Service proposal was deferred until the next Senate meeting.

97:026.

President's Report

Mr. Traves reported that the BAC final report was forwarded to him by the Committee, unchanged from the BAC XI report. He stated that he would consider the report, the Senate discussion, and all the input he has received from members of the University community in developing his recommendation to the Board. Mr. Traves thanked the committee members, recognizing their contribution to the University community. He further stated that several difficult issues had been raised in discussions of the BAC reports and that these issues would need continuing discussion.

Mr. Traves stated that he was obliged to review Faculty complement. He reported that

he was recommending a complement reduction of 11 positions for the coming year--this number is lower than the current number of vacant positions. His recommendations will be forwarded to SAPBC for comment.

Finally, Mr. Traves reported that discussions regarding the TUNS librarian were complete. This person will serve as Assistant University Librarian following the merger.

97:027.

In Camera. Honorary Degrees

The Senate moved "In camera" to consider the matter of Honorary degrees.

97:028.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
APPROVED MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Monday, 24 February 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Adams, Apostle, Archibald, Birdsall, Bleasdale, Bradfield, Carroll, Clark, Egan, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Kiang, Klein, Lydon, MacKay, Maloney, Moore, Patriquin, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Scassa, Siddiq, Sutherland, Taylor, Traves.

Regrets: Andrews, Brett, Cameron, Camfield, Coffin, Farmer, Fraser, MacDonald, MacInnis, McIntyre, Morrissey, Oore, Ricketts, Starnes, Tomblin Murphy, Wrixon.

97:029.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard requested that the in camera session to consider Honorary Degree candidates be the first item of business following the adoption of the agenda, and that item #6 become item #3. The items were renumbered accordingly, and the agenda was adopted as amended.

97:030.

Honorary Degrees

The meeting moved in camera to consider the matter of Honorary Degrees.

97:031.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 10 February, 1997 were adopted as circulated.

97:032.

Dal/TUNS Amalgamation

Mr. Stuttard reported that the Joint Steering Committees of Dalhousie and TUNS would meet on February 25th to consider the terms of reference of the Academic Council of TUNS. The Steering Committee hoped to bring the agreed terms of reference to the

March 10th Senate

meeting. The Academic Coordinating Committee met February 19th to consider a number of issues, primarily undergraduate and graduate scholarships. Combined scholarship funds at both institutions will be available to undergraduate students, the allocations to be made in April. For graduate studies, access to Dalhousie graduate funding will probably depend on students being admitted to their programs by the Dalhousie Faculty of Graduate Studies. At the moment the arrangements for Graduate Studies have not been finalized. ACC also heard a report from the interim Dean of the Faculty of Architecture, Grant Wanzel, who anticipated creation of a four-year Bachelor of Environmental Design Degree, with direct entry from High School. This would replace the present two-year TUNS degree which is open to students who have completed two undergraduate years at another institution.

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Academic Administration Mr. Stuttard moved:

That unless otherwise determined by Senate, the academic regulations set out in the 1996/97 TUNS Calendar will remain in effect for students and faculty at the "TUNS" College until the beginning of the regular 1997/98 academic session (i.e., the session beginning in September 1997).

Mr. Stuttard explained that this motion had been considered by SCAA on February 19th, and emailed to members. He clarified that the 97/98 Dalhousie and TUNS Calendars would contain provisions for grandparenting students currently enrolled in TUNS to enable them to complete their programs under the regulations in force before amalgamation.

The motion CARRIED.

97:033.

Atlantic Canada Universities Open Learning Accrediting Service

Mr. Stuttard drew members' attention to the circulated sheet summarizing SAPBC's concerns surrounding the proposal for an Atlantic Canada Universities Open Learning Accrediting Service. Ms. Hobson explained that this initiative had grown from the discussions of a committee exploring the feasibility of universities pooling their resources to create a system of telelearning that would enable students to take an entire degree by distance education. These discussions had evolved into a proposal for a full-blown Bachelor in General Studies. The degree would be similar to our three-year Bachelor degree. Students would take 90 credits. Though students would not declare a major, realistically they would need to concentrate their studies, given certain distributional requirements, the necessity of completing half of their credits at the third and fourth year levels, and the system of prerequisites this would entail.

The absence of the residency requirement was what made this proposal distinctive. Other universities across Canada had already created this type of degree.

Ms. Hobson shared some of the concerns expressed at SAPBC, in particular the strong possibility that there would not be a market for this type of degree. However, she interpreted the proposal to mean that whether or not we approved it, it could go ahead, and we would

have no way to prevent our classes from being used towards the degree, since any credits banked would be credits taken in the usual way. Given the likelihood that the proposal would be supported by the other universities, we needed to consider the best strategic response to the proposal, whether it was wise to take a strong public position against it. Mr. Ruedy was uncomfortable with the creation of another degree-granting agency, and thought we might get around this by specifying that a certain number of credits had to be taken at one university, and that that university would grant the degree. Mr. Clark was disturbed that this type of general degree was being proposed at a time when Dalhousie faced problems in maintaining the integrity and quality of its existing programs.

Mr. Taylor emphasized the need to look at the impact the proposal would have on Dalhousie. If it were not self-financing after five years, it would become an additional competitor for limited provincial resources. However, if it did not succeed, it would not be a major problem. We would need to watch it closely. Mr. Maloney asked how the institutional levy was intended to operate, and wondered whether the proposal would end up costing us more than it benefitted us. Mr. Rosson was worried this could be the thin edge of the wedge, and hoped we would be able to resist any tendency towards a wholesale adoption of this approach. Mr. Traves put the proposal within the context of the creation and success of the many new education and training programs in the private sector. I.T.I., for example, appeared to have as many students as Acadia University. One of the virtues of this proposal was that it staked out territory which would remain within the domain of the universities' control. Ms. Russell was pleased that we were not being asked to approve this initiative, since she did not believe she could recommend this type of degree or program of study to anyone. Mr. Stuttard pointed out the provision, implicit in the document, that students could only complete their 50%, or in another context 33%, concentration at participating institutions. We might wish clarification on this point.

Ms. Hobson summarized that this degree would most likely be used by individuals, such as housewives, who moved around and had trouble achieving residency requirements, and ended up with 12 credits from one institution and 15 from another. For them this approach would be valuable. Mr. Traves explained that within the AAU a majority of Presidents favoured the proposal, and it would probably go forward within that framework. He shared some of the concerns expressed by SAPBC, but cautioned Senators against publicly distancing Dalhousie from a proposal which appeared to be a priority for politicians. The proposal was still evolving, and many of the troubling features would be worked out. He would take the concerns of SAPBC and those expressed by Senate back to the organization and monitor developments.

Ms. Kay-Raining Bird wondered whether it would be more helpful and more powerful if the concerns were expressed as an official document from Senate. In response to a question regarding the responses of other Senates to date, Mr. Traves indicated that some were supporting it, some had had discussions similar to this one, and others were not that far along in their deliberations. To the best of his knowledge, no University had instructed its President to oppose the concept.

97:034.

Senate Library Committee: Dalhousie University Libraries Report

Mr. Stuttard asked Ms. Gregor, Chair of the Senate Library Committee, to introduce the Committee's Report, "Meeting Information Needs at Dalhousie University: a Strategy and Budget Proposal". Mr. Birdsall addressed the document, explaining that the Libraries had reached a turning point; we could no longer continue to fund the collections in the way we had in the past. The University had attempted to give the Libraries some priority. They had received special funding as a result of financial strategy recommendations made by a Committee of the Board six years ago; but that funding came to an end this year. The BAC recommendations translated into a 3.5% decrease in our collections budget. Over the past few years the Libraries had confronted increases in the cost of journals in the range of 15 to 20%, particularly in Science, Technology and Medicine. In the search for alternative ways of acquiring information, the Libraries were introducing a variety of strategies, focussing on enhancing interlibrary loans, electronic acquisition, and user fees. In addition, the Committee felt the need to subsidize this to some extent, and would be cancelling an additional \$55,000 worth of journals in order to establish a subsidization fund. In summary, the time of building massive research libraries was passed. Mr. Birdsall emphasized that the fundamental problem was with the whole process of scholarly communication. Libraries were at the end of the process, but faculty members were at the beginning, generating the research which was published. The issue could be addressed most effectively by faculty members and the publishers. The goal of the latter was financial gain, not the search for truth and beauty. In response to Mr. Apostle's question concerning the logic underlying the fixed fee structure for articles, Mr. Birdsall pointed out that the libraries would need to acquire material in different ways, and calculating the various fee structures would be an administrative nightmare. The fixed fee would be an experiment, and could be adjusted in future; but libraries internationally were moving to this approach.

Mr. Apostle noted that the Committee on the Changing World of Scholarly Communication, of which Ms. Hobson had been a member, had produced recommendations for changing the academic reward system for publishing. These addressed problems in the scholarly publications process to which Mr. Birdsall had referred. Mr. Birdsall agreed the Task Force and other organizations had revealed the need to examine the broad scope of the scholarly communications process which included the researchers, publishers and libraries, and to ask questions such as why publishers were publishing, and what was the purpose of the process. From his point of view, the process appeared to contain an element of immorality. Tax payers were

paying our salaries, paying for scholars to do research, to apply for grants to continue that research, and to buy back their own research from publishers who were in the business to make money.

Mr. Clark saw the Libraries' problems as reflections of those faced by the entire University. He was concerned that the solutions proposed would pass those problems on to University Departments, to researchers and to students. Given their tight budgets and the time constraints within which they were required to produce multiple assignments, students could not use the document delivery system readily. Consequently, some of the Report's proposals would have a direct impact on the quality of students' work. Recruitment of students might also suffer as the Libraries' resources were eroded. Mr. MacKay concurred that it was a sad day when faculty and students had to pay user and service costs for research. Ms. Hobson pointed out that the intention was to cancel those journals which no one used.

We were shifting internationally from a "just in case" library to a "just in time" library. Perhaps in the age of the information highway students' expectations were increased by their ability to identify electronically sources which in the past would have remained unknown.

Ms. Sutherland used the example of the Kellogg Library to illustrate the major problems. If we followed through with this Report, the Kellogg Library would be cutting approximately \$140,000 to \$160,000 worth of journals this year, roughly 22 to 25% of the existing journals collection. From a detailed data base of use, she calculated that to meet just a \$140,000 target they would need to cut every journal used 30 to 40 times per year. In some areas journals with circulations of up to 100 times per year would need to be cut. The Killam would also be cutting into fairly heavily used journals. The challenge was to rethink our pedagogical techniques. Faculty needed to prescreen what was available. Mr. Taylor reminded members that the cuts to the journals would have to go ahead because of the exponential increases in publishers' prices, and that the issue was to find an alternative system, rather than leave students and researchers to fall back on their own resources to acquire material.

Mr. Archibald wondered about the potential for inter-university cooperation on collections policies in the Novanet group. Mr. Birdsall noted that Dalhousie was the research university, with the research collection, and this sharply limited our ability to benefit from cooperation. However, he encouraged faculty members to attempt to increase cooperation with faculty at other institutions, citing the Women's Studies area as an example of what could be accomplished in this way. Ms. Sutherland added that in the Bio-medical Sciences the possibility for cooperation with the teaching hospitals had been examined, with the result that many titles had been rationalized. But some duplication appeared necessary for titles in the heaviest demand category, in light of the restricted hours of operation of the teaching hospitals' libraries.

Mr. Traves thought we were into a vicious circle in which faculty members were forced

to buy back their own work, sometimes at extortionate rates. Electronic publishing would not be an alternative if it was commercialized. We needed to work collectively as professionals to remedy this problem. Mr. Klein thought we could not boycott what might be categorized as the "rip-off" journals; but we could encourage colleagues not to submit papers to them, and libraries not to subscribe to them. The overriding problem associated with the proposed changes was that only those who could afford to pay for information would get it. The real need was to give the Libraries more money. Ms. Hobson mourned the loss of free access to information. But we were moving into a new world. We were at the mercy of international forces bigger than Dalhousie. Given the diversity of programmes offered here, we had to be prepared to seek out alternative ways of providing information. Mr. Bradfield asked how much of the capital fund campaign target was designated to the library. Mr. Birdsall responded that we had already secured a grant of \$150,000 from the Royal Bank through the capital campaign which allowed for the acquisition of business periodicals on compact disc. But such capital campaign funding was usually designated for a specific purpose or was one-time money, even though it might be spread over a number of years. We had the annual fund which took in roughly \$50,000 annually.

On behalf of Senate, Mr. Stuttard thanked the Senate Library Committee, its Chair, Ms. Gregor, and Mr. Birdsall, who had had a major role in preparing this Report.

97:035.

Motions re: Academic Titles

The Vice-Chair of Senate, Ms. Kay-Raining Bird, assumed the chair for this item. Mr. Stuttard reminded members that SAPBC had been looking at the question of academic titles for some time; had first brought motions to Senate in November; and had reconsidered the issue at Senate's request. As a result of further Committee discussions and email communications with Senators, he was prepared to move, on behalf of SAPBC, the motion circulated:

That in Senate Regulation 3.1.2, the words "holds a full-time appointment outside the University which provides" be deleted and replaced with the words "is not paid by Dalhousie University but has a".

And further, it is understood that only academic staff appointments made by the Board of Governors are covered by Regulation 3.1.2, and that for unpaid academic staff, "Adjunct" is the only word used to modify the appointment titles listed in Regulation 3.1.1 and the title "Research Associate".

Mr. Traves wished clarification as to the capacity of academic units to continue, under this proposal, to establish and maintain relationships with non-academics. Mr. Stuttard responded that if the question was whether a Dean could award a title of some sort, a

Dean

probably could. There would be no Board approval and the appointment would not have standing anywhere. The problem would arise if individuals with such positions tried to pass themselves off as having some formal relationship with Dalhousie. For example, the Dean of Health Professions had given examples of potentially problematic positions, such as admissions interviewers, and those had been included in the email communication of last week. Mr. Klein requested clarification concerning the positions of Research Associates and Clinical Associates in Psychology who received an honorarium. Mr. Rosson asked whether writers in residence, artists in residence, or executives in residence would now become Adjunct appointments. Mr. Stuttard explained the implications of the proposal for these positions. He noted that some Faculties and Departments might wish to review the titles given to certain individuals. Mr. Taylor thought that using "Adjunct" for both the Faculty of Graduate Studies and for other appointments would lead to greater, not less confusion. He was also concerned about the absence of clear sets of guidelines for the qualifications for appointments of this type which were made outside the Faculty of Graduate Studies.

Mr. Stuttard pointed out that the only effect of the proposal would be the positive one of allowing for a number of retirees, for example, to continue their relationship with the University. A range of individuals with varying qualifications who contributed to the University could still be recognized under this proposal. Mr. Maloney asked how this related to titles published in the Calendar, to which Mr. Stuttard responded that there was nothing about the Calendar in the motion. Mr. Ruedy saw this as a simple, straightforward proposal which did not change anything about the process of making Adjunct appointments. Ms. Russell was satisfied the proposal allowed considerable flexibility for recognizing the diverse contributions individuals were making to the Faculty of Law.

The motion CARRIED.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

That the Guidelines regarding post-retirement retention of academic titles, and appointments of "Professor Emeritus", as approved by SAPBC November 4, 1996, be adopted.

Mr. Stuttard explained that the motion was unchanged from that brought forward in November. The previous Vice-President Academic had drafted these guidelines ten years ago, and they appeared to have been followed during the subsequent years. But they were not a Senate document. The only change recommended was in the first sentence where it stated that "[I]t was understood that any retired faculty member may continue to use their academic rank title modified by the suffix '(Ret'd)'. The motion would continue the convention that "Professor Emeritus" is an honour, only to be awarded to a minority of retirees.

Mr. Ruedy found this useful. As a Senate document it could help eliminate some of the awkwardness surrounding the recommendations for and awarding of the status of Professor Emeritus.

The motion CARRIED.

97:036.

Report on Pension Trust Fund and Retirees' Trust Fund

Mr. Stuttard brought forward this item for information only. The drafters of the Report were not in attendance.

97:037.

Report of the President

The President reported on two important funding opportunities that we would be pursuing vigorously in the days ahead. The recent federal budget contained announcement of the Canadian Foundation for Innovation, an infrastructure designed to channel a substantial amount of money to Canadian universities to sustain and support a variety of infrastructure activities, ranging from computer networks to presumably physical space renovations. We awaited further details as to the kinds of expenditures this would cover and how one qualified. The funds were to be administered by an arms-length body from the federal government. The former President of the University of Toronto, John Evans, had been appointed Chair of this foundation and other appointees would follow.

The second funding opportunity was the joint federal-provincial initiative of some long standing, the Economic Development Agreement between Nova Scotia and the Federal government. Approximately \$170 million had yet to be expended. It could be applied to some of the projects that we pursued at the University; there were five or six general headings under this agreement. He would be working with the Deans to identify potential projects. Mr. Bradfield requested clarification concerning Mr. Traves' statement that extra funds had been made available in the budget. Mr. Traves responded that there were two infrastructure programs. It was his understanding that the Canadian Foundation for Innovation was a unique type of project, which would provide funding up to 50% in some instances. But the words were very general and vague. His hope was that they might maintain that generality. He did not have the impression the government was trying to make life difficult for the universities in this instance. He would learn more on his up-coming visit to Ottawa.

97:038.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

