

Halifax, Nova Scotia
Canada, B3J 3C3
Senate Office, MS 114
Tel: 902-420-5412
Fax: 902-420-5104
Web: www.smu.ca

SENATE MEETING MINUTES
March 12, 2010

The 524th Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, March 12, 2010, at 10:00 AM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

PRESENT: Dr. Murphy, Dr. Dixon, Dr. Butler, Dr. Vessey, Dr. Naulls, Dr. Barr, Dr. Beaulé, Dr. Bjornson, Dr. Charles, Dr. Dawson, Dr. Kimery, Dr. McCalla, Dr. Stanivukovic, Dr. Sun, Ms. Marie DeYoung, Ms. MacDonald, Mr. Corrigan, Margaret-Anne Bennett, Dr. Clyburne, Dr. Masuda, and Ms. Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr. Dodds, Dr. Enns, D. Wicks, Dr. Crocker, Dr. Neatby, Dr. Pendse, Dr. Russell, Dr. Stinson, Mr. Hotchkiss, Mr. Anderson, Miss. Dix, Mr. Gomez, Mr. S. Sun, and Mr. Mitchell.

Meeting commenced at 10:07 AM. Delay was due to the Open House activities.

09050 **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**
Report of the Agenda Committee was accepted as circulated.

09051 **SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY 2010-2011 OPERATING BUDGET**
A presentation was provided by Larry Corrigan.

09052 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

.01 Minutes of the meeting of February 12, 2010, attached as **Appendix A**.

Moved by Butler, and seconded, **“that the minutes of the meeting of February 12, 2010 be approved as circulated”**.
Motion carried.

09053 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**
None.

09054 **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**
.01 **Academic Planning**

.0101 Proposal for the Maritime Centre for Green Chemistry, attached as **Appendix B**. Drs Clyburne and Masuda attended to answer questions.

Discussion covered the following key points:

- Green Chemistry is one of the areas of excellence that has developed at SMU over the last few years. The centre concentrates the unique strength we have in this area but would network with others in the area to increase our ability to secure grants and to increase the profile of the chemistry department.
- The Chemistry department was asked to identify their strengths and in particular, in areas where they have something unique for this area. There is a significant amount of Green Chemistry that ties neatly into the Sustainability goals of the University. With Sustainability Week being next week, we were hoping that we could announce the establishing of this centre at Saint Mary's University.
- Question: Has any thought has been given to the title being the best one possible to retain its intention over the long-term? Answer: The words "Green Chemistry" are entrenched in literature and in Government.
- Under 5.1 – Directorship on page 8 – Change "5 years" to "a five-year term"
- Article 5 f shows a 6 year term for the Director. Answer: It was intended to be five.
- Throughout the document the governance structure alternates back and forth between Board of Directors and Board of Governors. Members were advised that it should be Board of Governors in all instances (see Article 4 in the constitution).
- Question: Maritime is defined as "of the sea". In this instance you mean the Maritime Provinces - Changes to Maritimes.
- Question: page 15 Article 5 b – states that the Director will serve as the principle investigator. Is this necessary? It seems a bit restrictive. It may not be the best strategic way to get funds. Depending on the topic, it might be better for someone else to be the principle investigator? Answer: Consistency was the logic behind that statement. A suggestion was to put "Normally" before this statement.
- Page 11, top paragraph –"Since the MCGC will be operating under the umbrella of the Chemistry Department or Science Faculty, it is envisioned that no operating budget will be required". Is this true? Answer: There is a potential for this Centre to make money. In terms of the operating budget, the funding would be internal in the department funding. The ICA and the CN Centre do not cost the University anything. There will also be some seed funding available from the Dean.
- Question: What about community members on the board? Answer: This is set up for academics and research. There is an outreach to the community but community education is done elsewhere on campus. Community outreach engagement is encouraged through the Dean's Office.

Moved by Butler, and seconded, **"that the Proposal for the Maritimes Centre for Green Chemistry be approved as amended"**.
Motion carried.

.0102 Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs, attached as **Appendix C**. Margaret-Anne Bennett attended to answer questions.

Discussion covered the following key points:

- This revision came about as a result of the MPHEC assessment report done in the spring of 2008.
- In January 2005, the new Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission Act was proclaimed. This gave MPHEC an expanded mandate. The focus of MPHEC is now on the student experience. They give first consideration to improving and maintaining the best possible service to students. They assess programs from the perspective of the student. The questions being asked are: What is the quality of the student experience in a given program? What are the outcomes for the student? This is a significant shift in emphasis.
- There is also a shift from occasional program reviews to a regular schedule of program reviews. One problem with occasional program reviews is that they somehow seem to communicate that the program is somehow flawed and/or at fault. The basis of these reviews will remain on peer assessment.
- The policy submitted today is proposed for undergraduate programs only. The intention is to have companion processes for the review of graduate programs and other areas of the university where a policy tailored specifically to the unit is necessary.
- One goal in these developments is to ensure that the burden of work on departments and/or programs is not excessive. CAID will assist departments and work with them to facilitate the process. Institutional Analysis will provide the statistical analysis/data for these reviews.
- Section 6.1 Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes is a good addition/change. At 6.1 a. Program Goals – It should state who the audience is. It should also talk about who this program is intended to serve. Answer: This was implied but not explicitly stated.
- Question: On page 4 – 5.4 It states: “Appointment of a Program Review Committee (PRC) consisting of one faculty member internal to Saint Mary’s who is not involved with the program (who will serve as Chair of the Committee)” How is this individual appointed? Do they come from within the department or Faculty? Perhaps we should be more explicit as to who that individual will be. Answer: It is not intended to be restrictive. Approval of the selection of all PRC members is done within the APC.
- This is a policy document, not a procedure document. Question: What are those procedures? For example, how is a representative Self Study Committee established? Answer: In this policy document, we are trying to strike a balance without being too prescriptive. Because of the unique nature of some departments, programs and/or units, this is left open in the policy.
- Section 5, point 7 should be changed to read “Responses to the PRC Report by the Department and the Dean“. This change was accepted as a friendly amendment. These responses may be very different. The current text makes it sound like the response is done in collaboration. Response: We noticed that there was a minimal role that the Dean played in the previous policy. We are hoping that the Dean’s role can be expanded to include facilitation and mediation between the department/program and the APC. This would be defined in the handbook.
- Question: Is the handbook going to be approved by the Senate or is it going to be an operational handbook? Answer: At the level of Senate, the policy is the issue.

- It was suggested that timelines should be placed on certain steps within the handbook. This is the only place where this process would have some teeth.
- Question: Section 5 - Steps 1 through 12 – is there a timeline for these? Answer: There is the assumption that the process should be completed within 12 months but there is nothing in the policy that commits us to that deadline. In this section there is the implication on the timing in the words “Academic Program Reviews are initiated annually”. If this is the target, it should say so.
- APC will be vetting the procedures and adopting them. The APC is a standing committee of Senate. Senate should not be bogged down with such procedural issues. The APC can move more quickly to resolve issues.
- Question: The version history at the back of the document states that there was an appeal process at one time. There is no appeal process in this document. Should there be? Answer: The Senate is the final body. Decisions of Senate are considered to be final unless the Senate decides to change a decision. If decisions of Senate could be appealed, who would you appeal to?
- A program review is a process of reflection.
- It is a reasonable assumption of Senate that a department or program will take the recommendations of peers and respond in an appropriate manner. The recommendations of the APC are the only recommendations sent forward to the Senate.
- The second last point in Section 5 is in regard to a one year follow-up report to be submitted to Academic Planning by the department on the progress made during the year. During the MPHEC assessment process they commented in regard to our lack of follow-up. It is not always easy to secure this follow-up.
- The Senate expressed their appreciation and thanks to Margaret-Ann Bennett for the significant work put into this project.

Moved by Murphy, and seconded, **“that the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs be approved as amended”**.
Motion carried unanimously.

.0103 Canadian Centre for Ethics in Public Affairs, Governance
 revisions attached as **Appendix D**.

Discussion covered the following key points:

- CCEPA was created in May of 2002 and a preliminary governance document that was approved by the Senate. Subsequently that governance document was modified to change the constitution of the board to bring in community members. This led to significant success in fund raising initiatives among other things. There were many issues that were not addressed in the initial document.
- In this revision, the mission remains the same as well as the composition of the board.
- Members were advised that this revision started because of the need to address the matter of insurance. The goal was to ensure all participants in this joint group were covered by the University’s insurance policy. During the review of the governance document, it was discovered that there were a number of things not covered in the document. The document that has been submitted has also been reviewed by legal council.

- Question: It states that this is an unincorporated organization with a Board. An example of a situation where personal lawsuits were launched against board members. This action affected the individual's ability to secure personal loans for a period of 10 years. Answer: This was the exact thing we wanted to protect against. This change provides insurance and indemnification for all the board members and participants. Each participant gets a letter to this effect. A lawyer will be hired to represent the participant if anything should happen.
- Question: Where does it say that in this document? Answer: The scope of the protection is covered in the University insurance policy – there is a formula in there that determines what is covered and to what level.
- Question: What level of coverage do volunteers have? Answer: The liability limit is 25 million per event. This is as much insurance as the University has overall.
- Question: Is there an increase in the rate? Answer: The rate has not increased. The increased activity is insignificant when you look at a reciprocal agreement between 88 universities.
- Question: Could some of the aspects of this be applied to other Centres at SMU? For example Gorsebrook Research Institute? Answer: TORs for several of the centres at SMU were reviewed during the process of reviewing this group's TOR. We found nothing in those documents that was of use to CCEPA. Some of the concepts are transferrable.
- Question: Is the reason that this has been pursued, because it was a joint university centre? Answer: Because the others at SMU have been approved by the Senate they are covered under the University and therefore it is covered under SMU's CURI insurance coverage. The key for coverage under the plan is that a group is doing things for the University and the university knows about that activity.
- Senate thanked Mr. Corrigan for all the work he put into this project.

Moved by Murphy, and seconded, **“that the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Public Affairs, Governance revisions be approved as amended circulated”**.

Motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate meeting be continued for 30 minutes to complete the business on the agenda.” Motion carried.**

.0104 Institute for Computational Astrophysics, annual report attached as **Appendix E**.

There being no discussion or objections the report was accepted into the Senate record.

09055 REPORT OF AD-HOC COMMITTEES

None at this time

09056 REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEES

.01 Honorary Degrees

Motion for ratification and five nominations attached at **Appendix F**.

Moved by Butler, and seconded, **“that the decision of the Senate Executive Committee to approve the five nominations submitted as Appendix F is ratified by the Senate.”**
Motion carried unanimously.

09057 **REPORT OF PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEES**

None at this time

09058 **NEW BUSINESS FROM:**

.01 Floor (involving notice of motion)

0101 Motion to establish a Senate Committee on Animal Care attached as **Appendix G**.

Discussion covered the following key points:

- Butler advised that much like the Research Ethics Board that is mandated by the Tri-Council, we have an Animal Care Committee that is also mandated by a regulatory body and that has not been operating under the oversight of Senate.
- Question: To what degree is this committee a joint issue?
Answer: We have an MOU and one faculty of MSVU holds an adjunct position with SMU. MSVU is responsible for their researchers but is under our scrutiny.
- It was suggested that there may be some issues on the name. The terms of reference would speak to this.

Moved by Butler, and seconded, **“that Senate adopts the motion to establish a Senate Committee on Animal Care.”**
Motion carried.

Moved by Butler, and seconded, **“that the Dean of Science and the Current Chair of the ACC, Dr. Paul Erickson, be charged to modify the Terms of Reference for the committee to recognize the role of Senate and present those Terms of Reference to Senate at the April Meeting.”**
Motion carried.

09061 **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 PM.

Barb Bell,
Secretary to the Office of Senate