

SENATE MEETING MINUTES May 9, 2014

The 557th Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, May 9, 2014, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr. D. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

PRESENT: Dr Gauthier, Dr Enns, Dr Smith, Dr Vessey, Dr Dixon, Dr Naulls, Dr Austin, Dr Bjornson, Dr Gilin-Oore, Dr Kozloski, Dr Power, Dr Russell, Dr Stinson, Dr VanderPlaat, Mr Hotchkiss, Ms DeYoung, Mr. Keir Feehan, Mr. Ryan Hamilton, Mr Slaunwhite and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr Dodds, Dr Bradshaw, Dr Francis, Dr Secord, Dr van Proosdij, Mr. Bryan Rice, Mr Gorba Bhandari, Mr. James Patriquin, Mr Michael, and Meeting commenced at 2:35 P.M.

13060 **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**
The agenda was accepted.

13061 **SPRING GRADUATES**
Hardcopies of the graduate listing were circulated as *Appendix A* to the Deans with a copy for the Senate File. A copy is available on-line.

Key Discussion Points:

- Dixon advised that the grad list is posted on the website now. There are more graduates and more distinctions this year. We also have two posthumous graduates in this group.
- There is only one graduate waiting on a LOP to graduate.
- The morning ceremony will have 40 confirmed faculty members participating from Arts and Science. We only have 20 faculty members confirmed for business in the afternoon. We would like to have more faculty on stage in the afternoon.
- Question: Will there be an orator? Answer: Alexander Adulov is orator. There are also two students that will be singing in the two ceremonies

Moved by Dr. Dixon, and seconded, “**to confer degrees and distinctions on those represented on the list (circulated as Appendix A) at the Spring Convocation**”. Motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Dr. Dixon, and seconded, “**to enable the Registrar to add such graduates to this list as may be identified subsequent to this meeting.**” Motion carried unanimously.

13062

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting of March 14, 2014, *Appendix B*.

The following revisions were noted:

- Page 9 Honorary Degrees – second large bullet – correct name
- Page 8 correct typo in title: change ‘Join’ to ‘Joint’.

Moved by Vessey, and seconded, ‘**that the minutes of the meeting of March 14, 2014 are approved as revised.**’ Motion carried.

13063

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None

13064

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

.01

Academic Planning Committee

001 Department name change proposal for Department of Geography to Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, *Appendix C*.

Key Discussion Points:

- APC supports the name change proposal from the Department of Geography. The rationale for this change is provided in the proposal.
- Question: How does this fit with the new department of Environmental Science. Answer: Geography has been involved in Environmental Studies since before there was a Department of Environmental Science. This will give more profile to the Department of Geography because it delivers courses and programs in Environmental Studies.
- Question: Concern was expressed that confusion may arise regarding how the School of the Environment fits into this. Answer: The School was approved in Senate at the time that the BES Degree was approved. The school was to provide a synergy for the Environmental Research and Teaching that goes on at SMU. This development was to raise the profile and to bring together Environmental Studies at SMU.
- Question: There isn’t anything that intuitively would lead students to the School website. Is there any data supporting this approach? Answer: There is a lot of public outreach going on in relation to the school. The focus of the school is external. We wanted to have one place on campus that students could go if they were interested in environmental issues. There are a lot of students that are interested in the environment but they are not necessarily interested in science.

- Concern was expressed that there was confusion in this regard. It will be incumbent upon the Dean to make sure that this is presented clearly and that student access is made intuitive.
- It was suggested that there is a need to identify what criteria are used to define a school at Saint Mary's.
- Members were advised that the School of the Environment is a good resource to help students identify what is available to facilitate their decision on what courses they want to take. It was noted that this issue is even more confusing at other institutions. The school is a way to provide students with clear and easy access to the environmental programs at Saint Mary's. The terminology "Geography and Environmental Studies" is a very common term in use across Canadian institutions to define these types of programs.
- One of the mandates of the Director of this School is to look at the curriculum content and work with the Departments, Programs, Chairs and Coordinators to create an environment of continuous improvement.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **"that the Senate approves the Proposal to change the name of the Department of Geography to the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies."**
Motion carried.

002 MPHEC Proposal for a Certificate in English for Teachers,
Appendix D

Key Discussion Points:

- This item has been withdrawn by the Academic Planning Committee.

003 Academic Planning Committee Terms of Reference revision,
Appendix E

Key Discussion Points:

- Gauthier advised that the committee reviewed the Terms of Reference for the Senate Academic Planning Committee and has submitted revisions in keeping with current practice.
- Question: The only significant change is in 5.2.4.2 - #2 and covers the incorporation of the program reviews. Where is the program review function currently if not with the APC?
 Answer: The Senate Policies on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary's University stipulate that the APC is in oversight over the program review process. Historically this has been the responsibility of APC but it wasn't specifically addressed in the TOR.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the revisions to the Terms of Reference for the Academic Planning Committee as found in the Senate By-Laws.” Motion carried.**

.02 Curriculum Committee

001 Revision to the Senate Policy on Submissions to the Senate Curriculum Committee, **Appendix F** (deferred from March Senate meeting).

Key Discussion Points:

- Concern was expressed in regard to the wording in the area containing the approval signatures. It was noted that the Faculty Council approves new courses, not the Dean. The Dean signs on behalf of the Faculty Council. **Action Item:** Revise the document to reflect this. The signature line for the Dean, FGSR should be revised in a similar fashion.
- Question: Page 3 – In terms of the signatures; new graduate programs are submitted to the FGSR Council for review and approval. In this document, they appear to go through the Faculty and then to FGSR. It was noted that the Faculty Councils of both the Faculty of Arts and the Sobey School Faculty Council approve all graduate courses prior to their submission to the FGSR Council. Science is the anomaly in that graduate courses are not approved at the Faculty Council level. In this case the appropriate signatures may be provided.
- **Action Item:** Page 1 – “Graduate submissions require the approval of FGSR ~~as well.~~” Revision - strike out “as well” in the paragraph for ‘1 October’.

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the Revision to the Senate Policy on Submissions to the Senate Curriculum Committee as revised. Motion carried.**

002 Revision to the Terms of Reference for the Senate Curriculum Committee as found in the Senate By-Laws, **Appendix G** (deferred from March Senate meeting).

Key Discussion Points:

- There is a Senate Policy on submissions to the Curriculum Committee. The Terms of Reference for the Curriculum Committee reference this policy document rather than articulate the process.
- Paragraph 5.2.8.2 and 5.2.8.5 are struck out. These sections fall under the responsibility of APC and do not fit within the mandate of the Curriculum Committee.
- Composition: the VPAR or a Dean has not been a member or active on this committee for many years as Senate approved a motion designating the Registrar as alternate for the VPAR. The Committee has designated the Registrar as Committee

Chair for the last several years due to the significant degree of knowledge of the Academic Calendar and the programs at Saint Mary's.

- These revisions are being made to reflect the manner in which the Committee currently operates.

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the revision to the Terms of Reference for the Senate Curriculum Committee as found in the Senate By-Laws.” Motion carried.**

.03 Academic Regulations Committee

001 Revised Senate Policy on the Academic Implication of Disruptions of University Business, *Appendix H*.

Key Discussion Points:

- At the last Senate meeting, the Academic Regulations Committee was tasked with the review of the Senate Policy on the Academic Implication of Disruptions of University Business because during the winter we had a series of storm closures on Wednesday several weeks in a row. This disrupted course instruction significantly for specific courses taught on a Monday/Wednesday schedule or only on Wednesday's.
- Any disruption of 10% or more of the course instruction would be significant enough for Senate to deal with it. The instructor would deal with course disruptions when there was less than a 10% disruption. The Regulations Committee thought that an appropriate change would be from '7 calendar days' to '10% or more'.
- Question: What exactly constitutes contact hours? Answer: If we had stipulated teaching hours, the time in labs, recitations etc. would not be covered. The timetable is expressed as a total number of hours. The Committee thought 'contact hours' would communicate the intention more clearly.
- Some courses do not fit this scenario, for example on-line courses. Question: What about those? Answer: There is more flexibility with on-line and lab courses and they tend to be less affected by disruptions. Most faculty at Saint Mary's think that if they have a course that meets for a certain number of hours for a specific number of weeks that constitutes contact hours with the student.
- It is difficult to develop a policy that covers everything. This policy was originally developed to deal with labour disruptions. This revision is only attempting to define when Senate should get involved.
- Concern was expressed that faculty members may perceive contact hours as office hours. Suggestion – change contact hours to instruction hours. Contact hours are thought of as hours spent in a class or a lab.

- Concern was expressed that one course a week in a seminar course could constitute almost 10%. Question: Would these courses be dealt with differently? Answer: If two classes were missed we would have to address that.
- The Committee has attempted to define short and long-term disruptions but it has to be understood in context. It was suggested that this be inserted in the definition section:
- Question: Was the policy intended to cover faculty members that are unable to deliver the contact hours? Does this automatically send such situations to the Senate? Answer: The Dean of the Faculty and the Chairperson of the Department address those situations. It is not the purpose of this policy to cover those situations.
- The motion was withdrawn and the document will be sent back to the Committee for further revision.

002 Revision to Regulations Committee Terms of Reference as found in the Senate By-Laws, *Appendix I*

Key Discussion Points:

- The committee has been asked a number of times to develop policies but the TOR did not cover this activity. The Committee is asking that the terms of reference be revised to include new policy development in their area of responsibility.
- The Committee also wanted to reference the fact that there are now two academic calendars instead of one.
- It was noted that the titles of the Vice President, Academic & Research and the Director of Admissions have changed and the Senate passed a motion in the past to include the Dean, FGSR for meetings to discuss items with graduate impact.

- Revisions are underlined below:

5.2.5 Committee on Academic Regulations

5.2.5.1 The Committee on Academic Regulations shall be responsible for the annual review of the general academic regulations as these appear in Section 2 of the Undergraduate and Graduate Academic Calendars (Academic Regulations and Admission Requirements), and shall recommend policy on them to Senate. The Committee may also recommend policy to Senate on activities or processes associated with areas governed by these regulations.

5.2.5.2 The composition of this committee shall be as follows:

1. The Vice-President, Academic & Research, or his/her designate, who shall chair the committee;
2. Two Deans of Faculty;
3. Two members of Faculty appointed by Senate, at least one of whom shall be from a Faculty not represented by a Dean;
4. One student in senior year, appointed by the Students' Association;

5. The Dean, Graduate Studies and Research for meetings to discuss revisions to academic regulations impacting graduate studies.
6. The Registrar;
7. The Assistant Registrar, Admissions and Scholarships for meetings to discuss Admission requirements;
8. The Director of Continuing Education.
9. Secretary of Senate (secretary).

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the revision to the Terms of Reference of the Senate Academic Regulations Committee as found in the Senate By-Laws as revised.” Motion carried.**

003 Revised Senate Policy on Re-Scheduling Final Examinations as a Result of a Disruption in University Business, *Appendix K*

Key Discussion Points:

- We are renaming this policy and have added a significant amount of information around the one paragraph at the bottom of page 2 which constituted the original policy.
- The Deans have requested some clarity in regard to the information that is on the front cover of the exam booklets.
- The Emergency Management Team requested that we clarify the policy in the event of an incident at the University.
- It was not known by instructors, but they can be fined and become responsible if they fail to respond to these situations.
- A typographical error was noticed on page one, third bullet – change “there should be invigilators or each gender” to “of each gender”.
- There is nothing here about students having to sign anything to provide a record that the student attended the exam. Some instructors do this while others do not. It was suggested to implement a sign in and sign out sheet with the invigilator having to initial that the exam was received. Concern was expressed that this would be time consuming, distracting and very restrictive and next to impossible in exams with 600 students writing. High numbers of students complicate this process.
- Question: How is this applied practically? Answer: Many institutions were researched across Canada regarding their policies. This is in line with the process at other institutions. Of course, it will impact the staffing requirements in terms of invigilators.
- Question: Does this include other testing throughout the term? Answer: Bullet point number one specifies ‘final examination’. Bullet point number three specifies midterms as well in regard to the invigilators requirement. It was noted that the policy

name is Senate Policy on Final Examinations. Midterms or other tests should not be impacted.

- There is also a timing issue... If you teach on Thursday and the exam is on Saturday morning, providing the 48 hour advance copy of the exam is not possible. Response: Given the way the new scheduling software is working, there will be a provision for two study days, so this will not be an issue. The two study day provision will be part of the next Academic Calendar of Events. It will be up to Senate to consider the change to that Calendar.
- This applies to both tests and examinations. Question: Which parts of this policy are for tests and which for final exams? Answer: The word test does not appear anywhere in this document.
- It was noted that if the instructor does not show up at an exam, if the Registrar's Office has a copy, the exam can be written without them. This probably happens once or twice a year. If there is a copy of the exam on file, the Registrar's Office, can copy and administer that exam. There have also been situations where an instructor has brought the wrong exam with them on the day of the exam.
- It would be an appealable issue if this policy was not upheld by the instructor
- Question: How can we be assured that students would not be able to gain access to the exams? Answer: The Registrar's Office maintains transcript information with complete confidentiality and should be able to deal with keeping exam copies secure.
- A practical exam is still an exam and if something happened to the instructor on the way to the exam; even if the invigilator were there, it is questionable that the exam could proceed. The students may not even walk over to the Registrar's Office to resolve the situation.
- This policy was made to provide the instructor with the authority to do something in a variety of situations.
- The intent of this policy is good but it is very restrictive and should be sent back.
- A policy to cover this situation is very important; however, some things go further than is warranted. For example it was agreed that there should be a minimum of 2 invigilators but the ratio of 50 to 1 was questioned.
- It was noted that Senators were focusing very much on page 1. Senators were requested to provide Dr. Dixon with their feedback on pages 2 & 3.
- Motion was withdrawn and the document will be sent back to the Regulations Committee for further revision.

13065

PROFESSOR EMERITUS RECOMMENATION

.01

Recommendation of Dr. Henry Veltmeyer, *Appendix J*

Key Discussion Points:

- The Senate Executive Committee has reviewed and approved this submission.

Moved by Gauthier, and second, **“that the Senate approves the recommendation to award Dr Henry Veltmeyer with Professor Emeritus.” Motion carried.**

13066

NEW BUSINESS FROM

a)

Floor (not involving notice of motion)

Key discussion items:

- In the Dec 13 minutes there was consideration of the 2013 Report on the Positive Action to Improve the Employment of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible Minorities, and People with Disabilities at Saint Mary’s University. During that consideration it was noted that the statistical data was wrong. The minutes indicate that a revised copy would be submitted? Response: This will be forwarded to September Senate meeting
- There was a report of irregularities going on during the evaluation process of a faculty member. During the evaluation process, the students are in a room by themselves. There have been instances of students discussing trashing their instructors in some way on these evaluation forms. Response: The reason it is done this way is so that the instructor does not influence the evaluation result by being in the room while this is done.
- Suggestion: Instructors be required to find someone else that is not in the class to administer the evaluations.
- Suggestion: Departmental Secretaries might be tasked with this responsibility.

13067

PRESIDENTS REPORT

Dodds was not in attendance due to other commitments.

13068

QUESTION PERIOD

None

13069

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary to the Office of Senate