SENATE MEETING MINUTES
April 8, 2022

The 634th meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, April 8, 2022, at 2:00 PM. Dr Takseva Chairperson, presided. This was a hybrid meeting - a zoom link was provided.

PRESENT: Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr Butler, Dr Bhabra, Dr Francis, Dr Ingraham, Dr Sarty, Dr Austin, Dr Brosseau, Dr Driss, Dr Fan, Dr Grandy, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr O'Brien, Dr Panasian, Dr Sanderson, Dr Taghavi, Dr Takseva, Dr VanderPlaat, Dr Zhyznomirska, Mr Brophy, Ms van den Hoogen, Mr Southwell, Mr Tumusiime, Ms Sargeant-Greenwood, Mr Will Kay, Dr Novkovic, Dr Akbari, and Ms Bell (Sctry),

REGRETS: Dr Crocker, Dr Stinson, Ms Mihika, Mr Cook, and Mr Sydney.

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm with the territorial acknowledgement.

22078   <u>**REPORT OF AGENDA COMMITTEE**</u>
The Agenda Committee report was accepted.

22079   <u>**PRESIDENT'S REPORT**</u>
Posted as *Appendix A* for this meeting (10 min).
Key Discussion Points:
Discovery and Innovation in a Learning-Centered Environment
- SMU celebrated student success:
  - 'March Madness' pitch competition
  - Student Leadership Recognition Awards,
  - Convening of the Sobey Scholars Network Spring connections event,
  - The current work of our Saint Mary's students at the Model United Nations assembly in New York,
  - The honouring of student-athletes this week.
- The President attended a Board meeting of Research Nova Scotia in the past week, focusing on research priorities for the province and how to support researchers in our universities, college and hospitals.
- This week there were announcements of the Strategic Research Plan that Senate approved at the last meeting and the Durland Graduate Scholarships. This gift of $3 million is a significant step forward for Saint Mary's in support of graduate research. The work on this project of the VP Advancement Erin

Sargeant Greenwood and the AVP Research and Dean of Graduate Studies and Research Adam Sarty was acknowledged.

Intercultural Learning

- The Board of Governors has acted on the recommendations of Senate and on the Governance Committee and has adopted the Scarborough Charter on Anti-Black Racism and Inclusion. The President was authorized to sign the Charter on the University's behalf. The President continues to serve on the national advisory committee, which is currently finalizing details for a further 'national dialogues' event at the University of British Columbia next month.
- The evening event on the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (March 21) was successful. Professor Adelle Blackett of McGill University presented on the development of the Scarborough Charter. Last week, at a very successful Triune Summit, three honorary degree recipients read from their work, the Honorable MayAnn Francis, Senator Don Oliver, Dr. George Eliot Clarke. VP Diversity Excellence Dr. Rohini Bannerjee and Equity Advisor Deborah Brothers-Scott were acknowledged for their work in organizing these events for our community.
- An important stewardship conversation has ensued with the Abidali Family, whose bursary for international students continues to have a significant impact.
- Saint Mary's hosted the regional celebration of International Francophonie Day, along with Alliance Francais and the office of the consul general of France in Atlantic Canada. One of our colleagues, Dr. Sophie Beaulé was awarded the prestigious Ordre des Palmes académiques.
- The President attended a timely meeting with the president and senior leadership of Xiamen University, a key partner in China, and participated in a webinar with the Canada-China Business Council.

Institutional Sustainability

- Congratulations to all those honoured at the Employee Recognition Awards ceremony last Friday. A special award was made to the Facilities Management team for their work in maintaining safe conditions on campus throughout the pandemic
- The 'Shared Vision' initiative from CONSUP continues to advance, with considerable progress being made on an information technology project with the Atlantic School of Theology, initial discussions on possible projects with NSCAD University and further meetings with our colleagues at Universite Sainte-Anne. We have received some funding for the AST project and will be able to implement this fully in the coming months.
- The Innovation Table of the Department of Advanced Education met recently and allocated funding to CLARI for the coming year and to several projects proposed by EduNova which will improve our capacities to attract and retain international students.
- We continue to work closely with both the provincial and federal governments to secure funding support for various initiatives and to effect policy changes, including brokering discussions between federal and provincial officials and ministers for changes to immigration policy. Senators will have noted the funding provided by the Province of Nova Scotia to some universities outside

Halifax for 'deferred maintenance and infrastructure'. We continue to lobby for Saint Mary's as a university that serves many students in the province.

- As a result of approval of the operating budget for fiscal 2023, the Executive Management Group has prioritized and approved positions that support academic operations (in addition to faculty searches and appointments that respect our commitments under the collective agreements).
- The review of the long list of candidates for Provost and Vice-President Academic and Research is scheduled for April 22nd and the first round of interviews with short-listed candidates is scheduled for the first week of May. In addition, the Registrar's position is now advertised nationally; Dr. Butler is leading that search. More information to follow at a subsequent meeting of Senate.

Questions:

- Question: May we have an update on the Vice Provost position search? Answer: This search is paused for the moment so that the incoming Provost can have input on that process.

22080 **VICE-PRESIDENT ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH REPORT**

Posted as *Appendix B* for this meeting (10 min).

Key Discussion Points:

Digital Learning Strategy

- There have been three consultation sessions on the Digital Learning Strategy, with more to follow. We appreciate the strong interest and engagement of those attending.

The Accessibility Plan

- The university has completed the development of an Accessibility Plan, as required by the Accessibility Act. Some minor but important work continues to finalize the submission of the Plan to the Directorate on April 30th. Appreciation was expressed to Dr. Lori Francis, Dr. Rohini Bannerjee and Janelle McNulty for their work in leading and coordinating the development of the Plan. Many others also contributed to the plan and are helping finalize some details. We are grateful for their efforts. But the real work will begin after the Plan is finalized. Implementation will take a great deal of attention and further development. The Plan itself will be a living document as the implementation unfolds and provincial guidelines are clarified. Once the Plan is finalized at the end of this month, Senators are encouraged to review it. Senate will have a significant role in ensuring its policies and regulations neither create nor facilitate barriers to accessibility, but rather support and even mandate academic practices to provide the means for an accessible and inclusive learning environment.

Transitioning out of the COVID era.

- Senate Executive has discussed how we should end the invocation of the Senate Policy on the Academic Implications of Disruptions of University Business. We propose that the time to do that would be at the end of this academic term, ideally effective May 1, 2022. The policy allowed for some of the fluidity and rapidity required to adapt to a shifting public health landscape but runs the risk of creating uncertainty and inconsistency as we remove

restrictions on activities and now plan course and program delivery purposefully and with greater confidence. It has been said many times that we will not return to the old normal, but rather a "new normal." This is important to recognize but is still fully consistent with a return to normal academic governance. The new normal will see faculty bringing new pedagogy into practice in their classrooms; will see greater use of digital learning tools to support both flexibility and accessibility for learners; and will see a greater mix and spectrum of offerings between our past model of either fully in-person or robust WWW courses. Learning from the COVID experience, we have standardized descriptors for mode of delivery to be:

• On-Campus
• Hybrid
• Dual Mode
• Synchronous Online
• Asynchronous Online
• Web

Detailed descriptions can be found at https://studio.smu.ca/course-delivery-modes.

This work to standardize descriptions was done in close consultation with the Associate Deans as they worked with Departments and Programs on questions related to scheduling and delivery. Many will recognize them as a more thoughtful and thorough set of descriptions that we started using last year. There is a chance to evolve, and we have time to consider how things should evolve out of COVID. There is much still to be done in reorganizing supports for faculty and to prioritize how that support is provided given the different levels of complexity of each type of delivery. Some of this will be addressed in the Digital Learning Strategy, but there is also an opportunity for Senate, through multiple committees including the Committee on Learning and Teaching and the Academic Literacy Committee, to be supporting discussions and providing advice on supporting pedagogical development, the challenges of digital literacy, academic integrity to name a few. Senate will need to monitor policies and academic regulations, as with the Accessibility Plan, to ensure that they are addressing and responsive to new issues and circumstances that will arise in this new normal.

NSCC Pathways
• We have begun early discussions with NSCC around how we can collaborate more effectively on pathways (both in and out) for students looking to go either from NSCC to SMU through articulation agreements, or from SMU to NSCC for programs that transition students from their undergraduate degree to their career of interest. It is very early stages yet, but the Deans at each institution are connecting to review past and existing relationships and to study a few where we know there is significant student interest from both institutions. The transition is proposed as of May 1st between the winter and spring terms.

Questions:
• During the transition back to more normal operations, clarification was requested on what the new normal was going to be so that issues that are being experienced in groups like the Academic Appeals can be addressed.

- Question: What is our sense of the precipitating event that would trigger a reversion back to operation under this policy? Answer: The health sphere has and will continue to influence our moves in that direction. We are managing our own health and safety protocols. We are one of the safest workplaces in the province because we have maintained our protocols where others have not. It will be important for us to follow science for the sake of the safety of our community. Civil society around us is still in a state of great flux and politicians are under great pressure to step back. However, we are being allowed to operate under our own policies within this new state of normal.
- Question: We have a discrete policy. How does that mesh with the public health situation? Answer: These are two different groups in terms of authorities. We have the flexibility to provide protocols that are consistent with the safety of our community and related to the disruption of academic programs.
- In the roll out of whatever the new normal ends up being, it will be important to articulate the SMU approach clearly and completely.
- Question: As we try to roll out online courses in the fall, how will that be impacted? Answer: The policy is not involved with that process. The courses that are online are there because faculty have chosen to offer them in that manner. We are not forcing faculty to teach online.
- As previously reported, the definitions of the six modes of delivery have been expanded and posted on the SMU website to guide the SMU community.
- Question: Define web versus on-line delivery? Answer: On-line courses are delivered entirely online by way of various digital teaching and learning tools. Instructors create a series of learning modules which students access independently via a learning management system. Web courses are much more sophisticated in terms of design and delivery. Web courses are taught entirely online in a combination of asynchronous and synchronous modes. There is more work to do in terms of support between the different modes of delivery, but we are working on it.
- Question: Is there the hope that the online courses will transition into web courses? Answer: Not necessarily. If it makes sense in terms of the demand or delivery/resource issues, we may want to consider it. In addition, a web course is completely predeveloped and peer reviewed.
- Question: Is it worthwhile to go though the Academic Regulations to review whether there are areas that need to be revised to reflect these modes of delivery? Answer: Yes, this does need review, but it must also be done in relation to accessibility.
- Question: Do the responsibilities related to the teaching and learning strategy fall under the AVP Teaching and Learning? Answer: Yes, and this strategy also falls within the mandate of the SCoLT. This also involves EIT related to the supports that are needed.
- Senators were advised that some other universities felt that this issue was larger and needed to be moved up under the oversight of the Provost of the University.

22081   **SMUSA PRESIDENT'S REPORT** (Academic)
Posted as *Appendix C* for this meeting (5 min).
Key Discussion Points:

- The April Senate meeting is the final meeting of the current SMUSA Senate Representatives. Isobel Tyler will be the new representative as incoming SMUSA President, and the other representatives will be determined shortly.
- Final Exam preparation – SMUSA in collaboration with the library are delivering snacks, study accommodations and academic support for students during the exam period.

Questions:
- The University Library advised that it was a pleasure for the library to work with the SMUSA executive team to support students. The library is also providing massages to help students deal with stress. This approach is made available by leveraging the offering that was part of the United Way Campaign.

22082   **QUESTION PERIOD** (length at discretion of chair based on business volume)
See above under each report.

22083   **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
Minutes of the meeting of March 18, 2022, were *circulated* as ***Appendix D.***
The following revisions were noted:
- Dr Stinson was present at the March 2022 Senate meeting. Correct 'Present' section.
- Page 14 – The motions following the record of the Senate review of the Linguistics program review documentation - revise 'Sociology' to 'Linguistics'.

There being no objections or further revisions, **the minutes of the meeting of March 18, 2022, were accepted into the record as revised.**

22084   **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS**
01   PNC Grading Option Guidelines (from December 18, 2020), *Appendix E*
Key Discussion Points:
- The three senior advisors and Mahbouba Kafrouny reviewed these guidelines. They worked on these guidelines with the results that are being submitted. This is much more streamlined, and the biggest change is that you cannot use this option in the following:
  o Honours Thesis,
  o Field Courses,
  o Co-op Work Terms,
  o Advanced standing credit hours - A P grade can be used towards no more than 50% of the credit hours required for the major, honours, minor, or concentration in their Degree Program, and
  o Courses with a recorded violation of academic integrity.
- The one concern is that you can only use it for four credit courses. This will be found under undergraduate Academic Regulation 5. It does not apply to Graduate level courses.
- Question: Are students cautioned concerning graduate considerations? It is assumed that students should know or have some firm intention of their future. That may not be the case and constitutes a risk for students. Answer: We have already approved this option for students. Students are being made aware of how this choice may impact them concerning graduate programs.

There is a section in the guideline titled 'Considerations' that addresses the risks to students. To identify the impact of COVID, several universities are placing a note on transcripts that states that the grade achieved was reflective of a period of significant disruption. Concern was raised regarding this practice elsewhere and to emphasize that SMU is not doing that with transcripts.

- Question: Why is the P/NC grade option not reversible or appealable? Students should be able to appeal a final grade. Answer: We should say the P grade cannot be reversed, but the NC grade can be appealed. It was suggested that Senate request the removal of the reference to appeals from this whole guideline. This was accepted as an amendment.

Moved by VanderPlaat and seconded, **"that Senate approves the PNC Grading Option Guidelines as revised for publication on the SMU Website." Motion carried.**

.02 Process for creating MPHEC program proposals (using the current MPHEC template from the MPHEC website) that can be consistently applied across all faculties and that identifies Dr Kay, Manager, Program Review as someone to assist with those proposals (Smith/Kay), *Appendix F* – APC Memo, *Appendix G - Policy docs (G1-5)*.
Key Discussion Points:
- There has been an enormous amount of work on this. Dr Kay was thanked for his work. This process ensures that programs get some early feedback on these types of developments to ensure that valuable time is not wasted on a potentially problematic program development.
- Question: Where does the SEM program work with this? Answer: They are taking input and providing guidance to programs.
- A website is also being developed to provide information and guidance.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **"that Senate approves the process for creating MPHEC program proposals as submitted in Appendices G1-5." Motion carried.**

22085 <u>**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**</u>
a) Academic Planning Committee
i. Master of Applied Economics (MAE) Program Review Documentation (deferred from March 2022), (Dr Akbari)
Appendix H – APC Notice of Motion, *Appendix I -* Recommendation-Comparison summary, *Appendix J -* Self Study Report, *Appendix K* - Self Study appendices (K1-7), *Appendix L* – Dean's Response to Self Study, *Appendix M* - External Program Review Committee's (PRC) Final Report, *Appendix N* – Program Response to PRC Report *(please note this response has been included in the Summary APP C only)*. *Appendix O -* Dean's Response to PRC Report
Key Discussion Points:
- One major revision that came out of this process was a bridging baccalaureate program. This approach has worked well and it is a revenue-generating program because students that do the baccalaureate program are self-funding.
- There are two issues that are of significance: 1) Scholarships – To be competitive with other similar programs, we have to offer competitive

funding to students. In past years, we have received funding from FGSR (which is secure), and the Dean also adds to that funding. This last is not consistent funding and to stay competitive we have to be able to offer a reasonable amount of funding per student ($10,000). To grow this program, the funding is important. 2) Resources – We need more faculty resources. There have been issues with available faculty for supervision. This becomes more of a challenge when there are sabbatical leaves. We also need to ensure that part-time faculty are PhDs and that can also be challenging. At least one faculty member is needed.

- Question: Do you pay the graduate students out of grants? Answer: Yes. Some students are supported through the individual faculty grants. The MAE is a one-year program. We cannot count on the availability of individual faculty grants because they may not be available when the student arrives on campus. The desire is to be able to offer $10,000 per student per year so that can be included in the letter to attract quality students.

- Question: In science it would be normal to continue supervision while on sabbatical. Why is that not operationally possible in this program? Answer: This is a one-year program. If the student starts in September and the faculty member goes on sabbatical in September, there is no personal contact between student and faculty.

- Question: Would not supervision be part of the sabbatical activities? Answer: While they are on sabbatical, faculty do not take on new students but can continue to supervise those they have been supervising.

- The VPAR advised that the Dean FGSR wanted to review this practice and that this subject is not within the scope of the program review in terms of Senate's oversight or approval of the program review documentation. The Dean FGSR advised that he is willing to discuss funding issues with the program.

- Members were advised that from time to time, the MAE program has also had to borrow resources from the undergraduate program. This created challenges for the undergrad program. As enrolment increases it is expected that there will be enrolment increases in these programs.

- Recommendation 1: APC encourages the program to continue to pursue strategic alignment with other programs within the business school.

- Recommendation 2: APC concurs with the Dean's response.

- Recommendation 3: APC encourages the program to work with the Dean and the Sobey School Career Services to explore alternate options in experiential learning and/or other methods to enhance the "applied" aspect of the program.

- Recommendation 4: APC Concurs with the Dean's response.

- Recommendation 5: APC is pleased with the program's response to this recommendation and encourages the program to continue in their efforts.

- Recommendation 6: APC agrees with the importance of this recommendation and encourages the program to continue to work with the library to address this recommendation. APC encourages participation in the annual Research Toolkit workshop series offered by the library.

- Recommendation 7: APC is pleased with the program's response to this recommendation and encourages the program to continue their work towards implementation.
- Recommendation 8: APC agrees that this is an issue that applies to all graduate programs and directs the AVP Research to consider the funding for research in a more holistic way. APC concurs with the response of the Dean and encourages the Department to consider how to leverage available resources.
- Recommendation 9: APC concurs with the Dean's response.
- Recommendation 10: APC concurs with the Dean's response and is pleased with the response of the program to this recommendation.

Moved by Butler and seconded, "that Senate supports the recommendations from the APC arising from the MAE Program as listed above." Motion carried

The following omnibus motion was moved by Butler and seconded,

"that the MAE Program submit an Action Plan, that is based on the preceding recommendations, to the Academic Planning Committee in time for the June 2022 meeting of the APC".

and

"that one year after the approval of the Action Plan, the MAE Program submit a one-year report to the Academic Planning Committee on the progress made on the Action Plan according to Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary's University".

and

"that two-years after Senate approval of the one-year report, MAE Program submit a three-year report to the Academic Planning Committee on the progress made on the Action Plan according to Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary's University".

Motions carried.

ii.   MMCCU (& Diploma) CME One-Year Report, Appendix P1 – APC Notice of Motion, *Appendix P2* – One year report
Key Discussion Points:
- The representative from the program stated that this process was useful for the program, and they are working on the recommendations.
- Dr Kay was thanked for his support during this process.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **"that Senate accepts the one-year follow-up report of the MMCCU (& Diploma) CME program as meeting the requirements of Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary's." Motion carried.**

iii. B Comm Core program one-year report, ***Appendix Q1*** – APC Notice of Motion, ***Appendix Q**2 – One year report.*
   Key Discussion Points:
   - No discussion

Moved by Butler and seconded, **"that Senate accepts the one-year follow-up report of the B. Comm Core program as meeting the requirements of Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary's." Motion carried.**

b) **Senate Executive Committee** (Dr Takseva)
Terms of Reference as per Senate request, ***Appendix R.***
Key Discussion Points:
- The responses from the standing committees have been submitted based on the review recommended by the Bylaws Committee.
- The language in the committee composition has been revised to allow for Librarians to participate.

There being no revisions or objections, the TOR of the Senate Executive Committee were approved as posted.

c) **Academic Literacy Strategy Committee** (Ms van den Hoogen)
Terms of Reference as per Senate request, ***Appendix S.***
Key Discussion Points:
- The Writing Center Advisor Committee was disbanded so that has been removed.
- Clarification of terminology has been included and the committee composition was adjusted as requested.

There being no revisions or objections, the TOR of the Academic Literacy Strategy Committee were approved as posted.

d) **Academic Regulations Committee** (Dr VanderPlaat)
   i. Terms of Reference – revision as per Senate request, ***Appendix T.***
      Key Discussion Points:
      - Addition of one elected member of Senate to provide greater academic staff representation.
      - Concern was expressed related to this being an elected Senator. Response: We were attempting to provide for the participation of a non-faculty member.

      Moved by VanderPlaat and seconded, **"that Senate approve the revision as presented in Appendix T." Motion carried.**

   ii. Undergraduate Academic Regulation 11 a & c, ***Appendix U***
      Key Discussion Points:
      - Revision to ensure it is clear to faculty that in the case of an academic appeal, the Registrar is responsible for changing the grade. Grade

changes using the Change of Grade form will not be accepted or processed when an appeal is launched.

- Question: Will students be allowed to appeal after the deadline if there are extenuating circumstances. Answer: Yes. That is consistent with current practice.

11. Academic Appeals
a. Appealing of Final Grades
(vii) Reference Academic Regulation 18, General Procedures
A student is able to appeal their grade under Academic Regulation 11 even if there has been an academic integrity incident brought against them in the same course, as long as:

a. the academic integrity process has been completed
b. the reason they are appealing is not related to the academic integrity incident.
c. it is understood that any appeals or appeal related decision under Academic Regulation 11 shall not override any decisions resulting from the academic integrity process under Academic Regulation 18.

c. Decision
If possible, within one month of receiving any appeal under (a) or (b) above, the Committee shall render and communicate its decision through the Senate Office to all parties concerned. In cases where an appeal is upheld and/or changing of the grade is required, the Registrar's office will make the change of grade in accordance with the decision of the Academic Appeals Committee. Pending possible further appeal, the Committee will retain the evidence presented to it for a period of six calendar weeks after rendering its decision.

Moved by VanderPlaat and seconded, **"that the revisions to Academic Regulation 11 a & c are approved as submitted in Appendix U." Motion carried.**

iii. Graduate Academic Regulations 17, 18 & 31 a & c, *Appendix V*
Key Discussion Points:
- Concern was expressed that the chair of the Academic Integrity Committee is the Chair of Senate, and the Chair of the Academic Integrity Appeal Board is also the Chair of Senate. This needs to be addressed through consultation with Claire Milton. Consensus was that this was a positive way forward
- **Revision to AR 17 a ii and v.** Key revisions are that hard copy no longer required and to update margin size to include 2.5 cm to be consistent with the forms.
17. **Thesis Handling - PhD Dissertations and Master Theses**
a. The thesis/dissertation must be submitted using the formatting requirements found in the "Format Procedures" sheet, available online at the University Archives web site. The formatting requirements include but are not limited to:
i. Typescript: Double spaced

ii. Margins: 1" (2.5 cm) margins on all sides. All text, including page numbers, images, and charts must be within these margins.
iii. Abstract (may be single spaced) must be a maximum of 350 words for doctoral theses, and maximum 150 words for Masters' theses. Should bear the title Abstract and include the name of the author, the title of the thesis/dissertation, and the date of publication.
iv. The title page must include the names of all advisors/examiners but cannot contain any original signatures. Students must include a separate Signature Page submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research: A page designed to contain the signature of all members of the Examining Committee, including any external examiners, if applicable.
v. The unbound thesis must be printed on good quality paper, measuring 8 ½" x 11" (21.5 cm x 29 cm)

- **Revision to AR 18a ii -** Update margin size to include cm to be consistent with forms.

18. **Major Research Project (MRP) Handling**
a. The Major Research Project (MRP) must be submitted using the formatting requirements found in the Format Procedures sheet, available online at the University Archives web site. The formatting requirements include but are not limited to:
i. Typescript: Double spaced
ii. Margins: 1" (2.5 cm) margins on all sides. All text, including page numbers, images, and charts must be within these margins.

- **Revision to AR 31 a (add vi) & c** to sync with undergrad regulation.

31. **Academic Appeals**
a. **Appealing of Final Grades**
(vi) Reference Academic Regulation 33, General Procedures
A student is able to appeal their grade under Academic Regulation 31 even if there has been an academic integrity incident brought against them in the same course, as long as:

a. the academic integrity process has been completed
b. the reason they are appealing is not related to the academic integrity incident.
c. it is understood that any appeals or appeal related decision under Academic Regulation 31 shall not override any decisions resulting from the academic integrity process under Academic Regulation 33.

c. **Decision**
If possible, within one month of receiving any appeal under (a) or (b) above, the Committee shall render and communicate its decision through the Senate Office to all parties concerned. In cases where an appeal is upheld and/or changing of the grade is required, the Registrar's office will make the change of grade in accordance with the decision of the Academic Appeals Committee. Pending possible further appeal, the Committee will retain the evidence presented to it for a period of six weeks after rendering its decision.

Moved by VanderPlaat and seconded, **"that Senate approves the revisions to the Graduate Academic Regulations 17, 18 & 31 a & c as submitted in Appendix V." Motion carried.**

e) **Bylaws Committee** (Dr Grek-Martin)
Terms of Reference – revision as per Senate request, *Appendix W.*
Key Discussion Points:
- No discussion

There being no revisions or objections, the TOR of the Bylaws Committee were approved as posted.

f) **Curriculum Committee** (Dr VanderPlaat)
Terms of Reference – revision as per Senate request, *Appendix X.*
Key Discussion Points:
- No discussion.

There being no revisions or objections, the TOR of the Curriculum Committee were approved as posted.

g) **Library Committee** (Ms van den Hoogen)
Terms of Reference – revision as per Senate request, *Appendix Y.*
Key Discussion Points:
- Addition of a comma in item 2 after SSB.
- No further discussion

There being no revisions or objections, the TOR of the Library Committee were approved as posted.

22086   **REPORTS OF JOINT COMMITTEES**
1. Honourary Degrees Committee, *Appendix Z*
Key Discussion Points:
- After a fulsome discussion on the merits of the two recommendations submitted by the Honorary Degrees Committee, the following motions were presented:

Moved by Robert Summerby-Murray and seconded, **"that be it resolved that Senate accepts the recommendation of the Joint Honorary Degrees Committee that the Board of Governors should award an honorary degree as presented in appendix Z1, and hereby makes such recommendation to the Board of Governors." Motion carried.**

Moved by Robert Summerby-Murray and seconded, **"that be it resolved that Senate accepts the recommendation of the Joint Honorary Degrees Committee that the Board of Governors should award an honorary degree as presented in appendix Z2, and hereby makes such recommendation to the Board of Governors." Motion carried.**

22087   **NEW BUSINESS FROM**

1. Floor (not involving notice of motion)
   a) Update - Academic Integrity Foundations (AIF) Workshop (Ms van den Hoogen)

   Key Discussion Points:
   - Academic Integrity Foundations (AIF) is an interdisciplinary online library assignment available in Brightspace that teaches students about the importance of academic integrity and how to avoid academic mistakes.
   - With the transition to online teaching and learning, and the large-scale change in performance assessment, faculty and students have been facing challenges with maintaining academic integrity, the rigor of academic programs and grade inflation.
   - Beginning in the spring term of 2021, the AIF has been offered to all faculty as an assignment to use in their courses. This assignment is currently being used in a variety of courses across all faculties ranging from first year to several upper undergraduate and graduate courses. Since piloting, nearly 1600 students have completed the AIF assignment.
   - Beginning in the fall of 2021, the AIF was used as one part of the discipline process for students with academic integrity violations. To date, 57 students have completed AIF for this reason.
   - Some faculty have consistently incorporated this assignment in their courses and feedback has been positive. Where it has been a requirement or assigned as a portion of the course, completion rates are high. If it is assigned for bonus marks or as an optional assignment, completion rates are low.
   - Sanderson and Harrigan were thanked for their work creating this offering.
   - Senators were advised that the Academic Integrity Committee helped to organize and offer the first AI Week in March this year. This raised the profile of AI with students and promoted networking between the faculty.
   - The library team was thanked for their participation and the President and VPAR were thanked for their support of this project.
   - Many AI cases that come to the AIOs as first incidents and a few of the second offences are identified as related to training/knowledge issues. Deans were encouraged to remind their faculty to rely on the resources that are offered to help students with AI issues.
   - Question: If 2000 students per year do this workshop, would this cause a problem? Answer: Sanderson and Harrigan are doing this work by themselves. The AIF modules are set up to be self-directed. Faculty may incorporate the assignment as part of their course offering. The administration work is related to the analysis of data. The feedback from the students tells us that they are finding the workshop useful. If 1100 students have taken this since last May then the current system should be able to handle 2000. The team has really missed the TA support in this regard, but they have been managing.
   - Senators were advised that many of the Faculties of Graduate Studies at Canadian Universities have mandated such a course for students.
   - The University Librarian has consulted with the Registrar and the Senior Director of Student Affairs & Services Brophy about their roles in this process.

- Memorial University had a similar assignment for years and the grades were handled by the Registrar's Office. The reason it resided with the Registrar's Office is because it showed up on the transcript. If we adopt this assignment more formally, it will become a part of our regular record keeping.
- If a student has completed the AIF assignment, that information should be part of the AI documentation.
- Senators were reminded that the intercultural nature of the AI process is very important. The Academic Integrity Appeals Committee recently had a training session that briefly touched on this subject matter.
- The President suggested that we should be using Brightspace to manage this. It should be included under reports to help with the data reporting requirements.
- Senators were advised that while this is a Brightspace assignment, the issue is getting the data from that. It does not currently appear on assignments. If the assignment is mandated, it would appear.
- A concern was expressed related to when the AIF workshop was completed. Ideally it should be done at the beginning of a course rather than at the end. It was suggested that this could be addressed in the same way as a WHIMS course and that could be done in Brightspace.
- The AIF assignment is being used within undergraduate 1000 level courses on a regular basis. It is also used in some courses at the 2000, 3000 and 4000 levels.
- It was suggested that a review of what violations go through the AI process should be done and the information on common mistakes made by students emphasized in the AIF course.
- Question: Given the concerns about the security of test questions, is the AIF assignment changing the questions asked every semester? Answer: There is a randomized question bank that is used, and the team continue to build the questions. We have not arrived at the point of deselecting questions. At some future date, we will.

b) To be consistent with the inclusive language initiative, and to avoid gender importation and binary categorization, it is proposed to change professor emeritus/emerita to emerit. (This also has implications for the usage of alumnus/alumna).
   Key Discussion Points:
   - The individuals bringing this forward were not in attendance. This item is deferred to the next meeting of the Senate.
   - Concerns were expressed. While the broader social/cultural implications are acknowledged and appreciated, 'emerit' is a constructed word and bad Latin. This requires careful consideration with a detailed and well-informed approach. The implications are wide ranging.
   - The term 'emeritus' is included in the collective agreements and all stakeholders should be included in these discussions.

22088   ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 4:16 P.M.

Barb Bell,