

## SENATE MEETING MINUTES April 19, 2013

The 549<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, April 19, 2013, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr. D. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

**PRESENT:** Dr. Gauthier, Dr. Dixon, Dr. Enns, Dr. Bradshaw, Dr. Vessey, Dr. Naulls, Dr. Austin, Dr. Bjornson, Dr. Pendse, Dr. Power, Dr. Secord, Dr. Sewell, Dr. Street, Ms. Marie DeYoung, Mr. Hotchkiss, Mr. MacDonell, Ms. Chimhanda, Mr. Coady, Dr. C. Singfield (Assoc Dean of Science (curriculum), Dr. Jeremy Lundholm (MScASc), Mr Slaunwhite (SMUSA), Mr Ermal Loshi (SMUSA) and Ms. Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate

**REGRETS:** Dr. Dodds, Dr. Barclay, Dr. Ivanoff, Dr. Russell, Dr. Smith, Dr. Stinson, Dr. van Proosdij, Dr. Wang, Mr. Michael, Mr. Perry and Mr. Bhandari

Meeting commenced at 2:34 P.M.

### **12058**      **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**

The report of the Agenda Committee was accepted.

The new Student Senators for 2013-2014 introduced themselves: Mark Slaunwhite and Ermal Loshi. Jared Perry, Michael MacDonell and Michael Coady will serve on the Senate for another year.

### **12059**      **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Minutes of the meeting of March 15, 2013, were *circulated as **Appendix A.***

The following revisions were noted:

- Under Enrolment Forecast, the last line on first page should begin: 2012-2013.
- First bolded bullet point on page two should be corrected from 'Budge' to 'Budget'

Moved by Bjornson, and seconded, **'that the minutes of the meeting of March 15, 2013 are approved as revised.'** Motion carried.

### **12060**      **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

**.01** Revised - 8-1007 Saint Mary's University Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship and Procedures for Reporting and Investigating Scholarly Misconduct circulated as **Appendix B.**

Key Discussion Points:

- Members were advised that the revision was required to align our policy document with a new Tri-Council framework document. Saint Mary's is obligated to have a policy that reflects certain aspects of the Tri-Council Policy Statement.
- An error was noted on page 5, the ninth bullet point – halfway through the paragraph - the word 'dictatorship' should be revised to read 'directorship'.
- On page 5, the new insert numbered 7 seems obscure. Noted wording was: "comply with relevant policies". A friendly amendment was proposed to change 'relevant' to 'applicable'.
- Also could we state what types of research activities the policy covers instead of stating 'certain types of research activities'? Answer: The tri-council document applies to a large number of activities that do not all apply to Saint Mary's. Our document only refers to those that apply to our university.
- Question: Do points 3 and 4 on page 3 include the misrepresentation of self in terms of course releases and grants? Answer: That is covered under point 1; section 3 Scholarly Misconduct which includes any falsification of data.
- Question: What is the purpose of section three, point #2? Would this be covered under FOIPOP? Answer: FOIPOP is law and a separate issue. The second point in section three was specifically tailored for research.
- In regard to part 2 under allegations, concern was expressed that this text and our Academic Regulation 19 may be in conflict regarding plagiarism by students. Answer: Academic integrity is a separate issue. We need to have a statement about how we are going to deal with these situations as they arise during research to be in compliance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement. This is the more common approach that has been taken by a number of our peer institutions.

Moved by Vessey, and seconded, **'that the 8-1007 Saint Mary's University Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship and Procedures for Reporting and Investigating Scholarly Misconduct is approved as revised.'** Motion carried.

**.02 Report from the Chair, Department of Sociology & Criminology - on External Review Recommendation #9 as requested by Senate, circulated as *Appendix C***

Key Discussion Points:

- Members were advised that this report was submitted in response to a request from the Senate for the Department to respond to Recommendation 9.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **'that the Senate approve the Department's response to Recommendation #9 as circulated.'** Motion carried.

12061

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROFESSOR EMERITUS**

Documentation circulated as ***Appendix S***.

- Nominated for Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies and History – Dr. Terrence Murphy.
- Nominated for Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies – Dr. Paul Bowlby.

Moved by Dr. Sewell and seconded (as an omnibus motion), **‘that the Senate approves the recommendations of Dr. Terrence Murphy and Dr. Paul Bowlby for Professor Emeritus status as circulated.’ Motion carried.**

12062

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

.01

Academic Planning Committee

001 M.Sc. in Applied Science Program Review follow-up report attached as ***Appendix D*** and ERC report attached as ***Appendix E***. Dr. Lundholm attended to answer questions.

Key Discussion Points:

- This item was deferred from previous Senate meeting.
- Gauthier advised that the program has responded to the recommendations of the ERC. There have been program revisions submitted to MPHEC and that submission has been approved.
- Question: In the follow-up report under other changes/issues is a mention of new departments to join the program. Has there been any action in that regard? Answer: Members were advised that the program currently has students in all three of areas mentioned participating in the program.
- Question: The external reviewers noted that the necessity of an external examiner (external to SMU) was no longer necessary. What has been done in this regard? Answer: This action has been initiated. Because of the multidisciplinary nature of the program, a reviewer whose area of expertise is completely independent of the primary discipline under examination but whose academic area of expertise is complementary to the primary discipline would be available within the institution.
- Question: Do many students go into the Co-op program? Answer: The co-op program has been very popular. A number of students have requested multiple work-terms. We have allowed students to take longer work-terms while in the program. These work terms count as a course. Officially we see the student reports from the employer and we have to sign off on those. The companies have been very happy with our students.
- Question: Are faculty active in finding/negotiating placements or does the coop office doing that? Answer: We encourage the student to find their work-term placements. The students are also able to go to the office to search for jobs.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **“that the Senate accepts the follow-up report of the M.Sc. in Applied Science as meeting the requirements of the Senate Policy.” Motion carried.**

002 FGSR: Joint MA – Women and Gender Studies program with MSVU documents attached as **Appendix F**  
Key Discussion Points:

- This item was deferred from previous Senate meeting.
- Members were advised of the following:
  - We have a joint program with MSVU. Initially this was a joint program between MSVU, Saint Mary's and Dalhousie but Dalhousie withdrew from the program a number of years ago.
  - The program was participated in a program review during the fall of 2010. There were some substantive recommendations.
  - Students in the program are very happy with the content and quality of the program overall. It is well subscribed to.
  - There was an issue with the interaction between the two institutions and this created issues for the students in regard to trying to navigate between the two institutions.
  - The delay in getting the outcome of this program review to the Senate was the undertaking related to developing a joint action plan. A stalemate occurred between the two institutions in regard to moving this forward. Some of the issues like registration were out of the control of the departments within both institutions. To resolve these issues the Deans of both MSVU and SMU were asked to collaborate to produce a plan. That has been submitted here. This is modeled after another graduate program we have that is very successful and that model works very well.
  - The program review was carried out at both institutions at the same time and as expected there are some recommendations that only apply to MSVU and others that only apply to Saint Mary's.
  - This same document is going forward to the Senate of MSVU.
- Questions: If this is approved, will the Curriculum committee see a list of approved MSVU courses in the next curricular process for the 2014-2015 Academic Calendar? Answer: Yes.
- Question: Will we also be seeing applications for adjunct professor status? Answer: Yes
- Question: How does the Department of Sociology and Criminology feel about hosting the WMST Program? Answer: The department actually proposed this solution. Members were advised that the current chair and the current program coordinators support this plan.

Moved by Vessey and seconded, **“that the Senate accepts the actions as detailed in the memo of 19 February in response to the final report of the External Review Committee and requests a follow-up report in May of 2014.” Motion carried.**

004 Women and Gender Studies, undergraduate program review attached as **Appendix G**  
Key Discussion Points:

- This item was deferred from previous Senate meeting.
- Members were advised of the following:
  - The outcome has to be seen in the context of what is happening at the graduate program level.
  - The WMST program was established in 1991 as a shared program between three universities. Through the years and given various changes and issues, this became a program that was delivered exclusively through Saint Mary's. Some issues developed that resulted in the program being suspended.
  - It was decided that the undergraduate program would have to be considered in context with the graduate program and that explains the delay in submission to Senate. The delay was to allow for both programs to be reviewed.
  - In 2007 the orientation of the graduate program shifted from Women's Studies to Women and Gender Studies. A submission for modification to the graduate program was approved by Senate and submitted and approved by MPHEC. Informally the undergraduate program assumed that same intellectual direction, but no formal submission was made to Senate or MPHEC. Recognizing the general shift in academic focus among faculty toward Women and Gender Studies, it appears that the best way to move forward is to terminate the existing program that is focused on Women's Studies only. We are not currently offering a Women's Studies program. We still offer courses in Women's Studies that can be continued, but we will not be supporting continuation of the program in Women's Studies.
- Question: At what point will there be a new request from the Women and Gender Studies Undergraduate program?  
Answer: The department is having a strategic planning meeting and they will be discussing that question.
- Question: Are there students expecting to complete a minor?  
Answer: There have only been four students that were interested in pursuing this program over the last 3 – 4 years. We have advised them of a program of studies and dealt with the issue when they have fulfilled the requirements.
- If we approve the motion, we will need to submit a termination proposal to MPHEC. This should be short and direct as there are no students in the current program that need to be accommodated.
- The program was around for 20 years before it was suspended. The highest number of majors ever enrolled in the program was 5 but that dropped to 2 or 3 and one year there was none. The viability of this program was questioned because of the minimal interest from students.

- Question: Are there other graduate programs where we have a program at the graduate level but not at the undergrad?  
Answer: Yes! An example would be MMCCU.
- Gratitude was expressed to the many people who assisted and/or participated in the multitude of activities required to produce this submission to the Senate.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **“that the Senate recognize Women’s Studies as a sub-disciplinary area of study at the undergraduate level to be administered through the Department of Sociology and Criminology. While the Women’s Studies Program is no longer viable under the original terms of the collaborative agreement between Dalhousie, Mount Saint Vincent University and Saint Mary’s University, there is a continuing opportunity for the department to offer a limited range of courses with the WMST designations. Senate approves the discontinuation of the Women’s Studies Major, Minor, Honours and Concentration effective as of the 2013-2014 academic year, with the understanding that suitable arrangements for any students still enrolled in the program will be provided.”** Motion carried.

005 Master of Management – MMCCU program review documentation: ***Appendices H, I, J, K and L.***

Moved by Vessey and seconded,

- 1) **“that the Senate accepts the MMCCU Program’s approach to the recommendations of the External Reviewers;**
- 2) **That Senate directs the MMCCU program to submit an action plan within 60 days to the Academic Planning Committee based on their response to the report of the External reviewers and taking into account the response of the Deans to the external reviewers final report;”**
- 3) **that Senate directs the MMCCU program to submit a one-year follow-up report to Senate by May, 2014 as defined in section five of the Senate Policy on the Review of Graduate programs at Saint Mary’s University.”** Motion carried.

006 Chemistry, undergraduate program review attached as ***Appendices M, N, O, P and Q.***

Key Discussion Points:

- This item was deferred from previous Senate meeting.
- It was requested that the APC structure the memos to Senate as a clearly articulated motion.
- Dr. Singfield, Chair, Department of Chemistry was available to answer questions.
- Question: The table of contents in the self-study indicates a strategic plan as Appendix A. The strategic plan was not included in the documents circulated to Senate. Why?

Answer: Due to the large volume of documentation, the appendices are not circulated in hard copy. They are available on request in electronic form.

- Question: Is there a plan for the next five-year period?  
Answer: Members were advised that the longer-term plan is almost complete.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded,

- 1) **“that the Senate accepts the approach of the Department of Chemistry to the recommendations of the External Reviewers;**
- 2) **that the Senate directs the Department of Chemistry to submit an action plan within 60 days to the Academic Planning Committee based on their response to the report of the External Reviewers; and**
- 3) **that the Senate directs the Department of Chemistry to submit a one-year follow-up report to Senate by May, 2014 as defined in section five of the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs at Saint Mary’s University.” Motion carried.**

**.02 Faculty Councils**

Sobey School of Business 2013-2018 Strategic Plan circulated as **Appendix R.**

Key Discussion Points:

- Bradshaw advised that this was submitted for information only.
- There being no objections the plan was accepted into the record.

**12063**

**NEW BUSINESS FROM**

a) Floor (not involving notice of motion)

- Members were asked to consider moving to an electronic circulation of Senate documentation to improve sustainability and to ensure complete documentation was available to those Senators wishing to review it.
- Concern was expressed in regard to security of information.
- Members were advised that the Academic Planning Committee uses SMUport Groups to deal with access to meeting documentation. At the Board of Governors this discussion is also occurring. The smart board in this meeting room is also available to display documents during the meeting.
- It was suggested that time may be needed to prepare the infrastructure for this action.
- Another suggestion was that summary documentation be circulated to reduce the volume of meeting documentation.
- Members were advised that MPHEC uses Dropbox. It was noted that in their academic reviews it is important to have access to all the documentation.

Moved by Secord and seconded, **“that Senate documents be circulated available electronically, with in-camera documentation to**

**be circulated in paper form at the meeting. The full implementation date will be September 2013.” Motion carried.**

b) Floor (involving notice of motion)

c) Chair

- **Special Case for Convocation**

Key Discussion Points:

- The Dean FGSR advised that the student is a candidate in our PhD program. The achievements to date are significant. The student has made considerable progress in the program which was started in 2007. Progress was delayed due to illness. Extensions were approved. All course work is completed and the candidacy exam was written. The draft dissertation proposal is complete including the research. Final dissertation was almost complete. The student published papers from this work, and completed everything but the thesis submission and defense
- The recommendation that this student be considered for the awarding of the doctorate came forward from her program not the student or her family.
- This is a very unique case. We occasionally award posthumous degrees and this request is in-line with that culture.
- Senate Executive discussed this case at length and considered if this would set a precedent. The Committee decided this was a unique case.
- This is not unprecedented in the local university environment. Dalhousie had a case like this last year that was awarded.

Moved by Vessey, and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the awarding of a Doctor of Philosophy in Business Administration (Management) to this student at the Spring Convocation.” Motion carried unanimously.**

**12064 PRESIDENTS REPORT**

Dodds sends regrets.

**12065 QUESTION PERIOD**

Key Discussion Points:

- Members noted the significant volume of work that has been coming out of the Academic Planning Committee. The Committee and the programs being reviews are commended for all the work that has been done. As one of the roles the Academic Senate has, the opinion was expressed that this is a very positive initiative and responsibility. This demonstrates the relevance of the Senate and the review processes of Senate.

**12066 ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

Barb Bell,  
Secretary to the Office of Senate