

SENATE MEETING MINUTES March 15, 2013

The 548th Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, March 15, 2013, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr. D. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

PRESENT: Dr. Gauthier, Dr. Dixon, Dr. Bradshaw, Dr. Naulls, Dr. Austin, Dr. Bjornson, Dr. Pendse, Dr. Ivanoff, Dr. Power, Dr. Secord, Dr. Sewell, Dr. Stinson, Dr. Street, Dr. Wang, Ms. Marie DeYoung, Mr. Michael, Mr. Coady, Mr. Darrell Rooney, Ms Gabe Morrison, Dr. Jeremy Lundholm, Dr. Edna Keeble and Ms. Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate

REGRETS: Dr. Dodds, Dr. Enns, Dr. Smith, Dr. Vessey, Mr. Hotchkiss, Dr. Barclay, Dr. Russell, Dr. van Proosdij, Mr. Perry, Mr. MacDonell, Ms. Chimhanda, and Mr. Gorba Bhandari

Meeting commenced at 2:38 P.M.

12049 REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE

Because of the absence of the Deans of Arts and Graduate Studies, Appendix D and F are deferred until the April Senate meeting. The revised report of the Agenda Committee was accepted.

12050 SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY 2013-2014 OPERATING BUDGET

The 2013-2014 Operating Budget was presented by Darrell Rooney and Gabe Morrison
Key Discussion Points:

- This is a balanced budget as required by our Board of Governors.
- This budget proposal will go to the Finance Committee of the Board of Governors next week and then to the full Board of Governors meeting on March 26th

12051 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting of January 11, 2013, were *circulated as Appendix A.*

The following revision was noted:

Page two, the fifth bullet down from the top of the page – change 'parody' to 'parity'. Moved by Pendse, and seconded, **'that the minutes of the meeting of January 11, 2013 are approved as revised.'** Motion carried.

12052 BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

.01 Follow up report to the 2009 Program Review of Sociology and Criminology, circulated as **Appendix B.**

Key Discussion Points:

- The previous document circulated had printing errors
- The follow-up report does not address recommendation nine. Members requested a follow up response from Dr. Westhaver addressing recommendation 9.
- Members request that future documentation be provided in chronological order.

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **"that the Senate accept the follow-up report from the Department of Sociology and Criminology as meeting the requirement of**

Article 5 ‘Steps in the Review Process’ of the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs at Saint Mary’s University with stipulation that the department provide a follow-up status on Recommendation #9.” Motion carried.

12053 REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

.01 Academic Planning Committee

001 MSc in Applied Science Program Review follow-up report attached as attached as **Appendix C**

Key Discussion Points:

- Academic Planning Committee has supplied a memo indicating that the committee has reviewed and accepted the follow-up report from the MSc in Applied Science Program and is forwarding it for consideration. The ERC recommendations have been attached.
- Members requested the full ERC report and to defer consideration until Dr. Vessey was in attendance.

002 FGSR: Joint MA – Women and Gender Studies program with MSVU documents attached as **Appendix D**

Key Discussion Points:

- Deferred until Dean Enns is in attendance.

003 Political Science Program Review documentation attached as **Appendix E**

Key Discussion Points:

- Documents are a result of the program review process.
- Question: Has anything been done in response to the reviewer’s expressed concern about the number of required credit hours and subsequent commitment of credit hours necessary for a major or honours degree as it relates to the introductions to the disciplinary subfields as full year courses? Answer: We have not changed those courses.
- Question: You have a four-year Arts degree now. Should the department consider requiring more credits hours for the major? Answer: The department felt that they could work within the existing parameters. The program is comparable to similar programs.
- Question: In Dean Enns response to the department’s response, she recommends more credit hours at the third and fourth level (15) which is equivalent to one semester. Is this adequate for the Major? In other programs there isn’t a big difference between requirements for the Honors and Major. Answer: From an institutional perspective keeping it as is provides more latitude for the students. In terms of fulfilling the requirements for a Major, the department does not see an issue with this.
- Question: All four of the courses are six credit hour courses. Concern was expressed about students taking one 1000 level course and then signing up for all four of these. They could get half way through the year and have their studies derailed by a life occurrence. They would get zero credit for a half year of work. An increasing number of SMU students are no longer traditional students. We offer more courses in the summer because of student demand. This structure makes it difficult for the students. Answer: We have not seen this develop in practice. From a pedagogical perspective this is crucial to our program. We have created a cohort of students that are funneling into our graduate programs. This program is very successful. There are ways in which a student may withdraw on compassionate grounds and there are ways within which the flexibility can be offered to those that require it.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **“that the Senate accepts the approach of the POLI Department to the recommendation of the Program Review Committee and requests a follow-up report to be submitted as per Article 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs at Saint Mary’s University on or about March, 2014.” Motion carried.**

004 Women and Gender Studies, undergraduate program review attached as **Appendix F**

Key Discussion Points:

- Deferred until Dean Enns is in attendance.

005 Joint Program Opportunity - Sobey School of Business & Beijing Normal University (Zhuhai) attached as **Appendix G**

Key Discussion Points:

- Members were advised that this item is being brought forward to Senate for information.
- MPHEC does not have a process for approval of this type of proposal but if they develop one, we will bring this back to the Senate for full approval. This is a significant initiative by the University.
- Question: How does this differ except in terms of the location of classes? Answer: It is exactly the same as your existing program. Instead of the students coming here, the faculty will go to China. This is not a joint program, this is just an extension program.
- There has been a discussion with MPHEC about this type of situation but they do not have an answer at this time. They are aware of this proposal and understand that we are fully engaged in the development of this program. They will advise when they develop guidelines for this type of development.
- UNB runs a similar program in Trinidad. CBU also offers a program in Egypt.
- This is a significant commitment in terms of faculty resources. There is a lot of enthusiasm among the faculty involved.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the proposal for implementation as appropriate.” Motion carried.**

.02 Continuing Education

Motion to revise Committee Composition attached as **Appendix H**

Key Discussion Points:

- Mr. Michael advised that the Senate approved the expansion of the membership of this committee. Subsequently we have identified individuals to serve in this capacity.

Moved by Michael and seconded, **“that the Senate accepts the nominations of the committee.” Motion carried.**

.03 Honorary Degrees

Motion to ratify Senate Executive Committee decision attached as **Appendix I**

Key Discussion Points:

- Dr. Dodds was unable to attend today but due to time constraints in relation to Spring Convocation it was important to move this item forward.

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate ratifies the decision of the Senate Executive Committee in regard to recommendations submitted for Honorary Degrees.” Motion carried.**

12054

NEW BUSINESS FROM

a)

Floor (not involving notice of motion)

Revision – 8-1007 Saint Mary’s University Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship and Procedures for Reporting and Investigating Scholarly Misconduct, circulated as **Appendix J**

Key discussion items:

- The changes in the document were individually identified due to the failure of the printing to pick up highlighted sections of the text.
- Question: Are we being asked to approve the revisions? Answer: Yes
- Question: Is the original policy posted on the website? Answer: Yes.
- There appears to be a disconnect in regard to who is responsible for the undergraduate students.

In the proposed policy statement the Dean of Research is given the responsibility to ensure the maintenance of the highest standard of integrity in research. As the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean of Research is directly responsible for graduate students and also through this document is given responsibility for faculty and for undergraduate students involved in research.

The need for clarity arises from the fact that undergraduate students are under the jurisdiction of their respective Deans. It does not appear that this is fully acknowledged in the proposed policy. Virtually all undergraduate research is conducted within the context of the course. These courses are the responsibility of the Deans of the undergraduate faculties.

While this is mentioned, it does not seem to be completely clear which Dean would have ultimate jurisdiction should an undergraduate be involved in a question of integrity which was not fully within the confines of course.

- It was noted that Dean of Research is also the Associate Vice President, Research. Members were advised that this issue is addressed in point #4 under Definitions.
- Referred back to Dean Vessey to provide clarity.

12055

PRESIDENTS REPORT

Dr Dodds was not in attendance:

12056

QUESTION PERIOD

Key Discussion Points:

- Question: In the University budget under budget increase highlights – academic initiatives there an amount allocated to part-time and overload teaching but no increase with respect to full-time faculty. Does this breach the clause in the full time faculty collective agreement? Answer: We are fully aware of this. We are attempting to bring these figures back to pre-2011-2012 budget figures subsequent to the cuts made in 2011-12. There is one initial full-time position being proposed to the Board in this budget with the intention of future increases if the funding is there. The environment is too uncertain to be able to provide anything else.
- Vacancies have been able to be filled and some additions have been made because of the financial prudence of past budgetary processes. We are not placing the university into a debt situation as some of the other institutions have done.
- A member noted that there is good news in regard to the recovery in enrolment compared to the numbers we had 8 years ago. The recovery is taking place in different areas and that might cause some significant strain.

12057

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary to the Office of Senate