



One University. One World. Yours.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada  
B3H 3C3  
Senate Office  
Tel: 902-420-5412  
Web: www.stmarys.ca

## SENATE MEETING MINUTES December 12, 2014

The 561<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, December 12, 2014, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr D. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

**PRESENT:** Dr Dodds, Dr Gauthier, Dr Dixon, Dr Bradshaw, Dr MacDonald, Dr Smith, Dr Vessey, Dr Naulls, Dr Power, Dr Austin, Dr Bjornson, Dr Campbell, Dr Francis, Dr Gilin-Oore, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Kozloski, Dr Short, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr VanderPlaat, Ms Marie DeYoung, Mr Hotchkiss, Mr Feehan, Mr. Hamilton, Mr Patriquin, Dr Hanley, Dr Singfield, Dr Howell, H. Weigand, and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

**REGRETS:** Dr Secord, Dr Warner, Mr Michael, Mr Dhaduk, and Mr Rice.

Meeting commenced at 2:35 P.M.

**14030**      **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**  
The report of the Agenda Committee was accepted.

**14031**      **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**  
Minutes of the meeting of November 14, 2014, were *circulated* as *Appendix A*.  
The following revisions were noted:

- Mr Feehan was not in attendance at the last meeting and is missing from the regrets section.

Moved by Bjornson, and seconded, **“that the minutes of the meeting of November 14, 2014 are approved as revised.” Motion carried.**

**14032**      **REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEES**  
.01      **Honorary Degrees, Appendix B**

- Those submitted could be for spring or fall awards.

An omnibus motion was moved by Dr. Dixon, and seconded, **“to approve the recommendations as submitted by the honorary Degrees Committee.” Motion carried**

**14033**      **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**  
.01      Positive Action to Improve the Employment of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible Minorities and People with Disabilities

- i) Revised 2013 Report on ‘Positive Action To Improve The Employment Of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible Minorities And People With Disabilities’, *Appendix C*.

**Key discussion points:**

- There was a concern about the methodology used in the 2013 report. Senate member Dr Power assisted with the revisions that have been completed.
- The Federal Employment Equity Act Guidelines require comparison of internal representation relative to the workforce availability for the four groups as determined through Statistics Canada labour force surveys. Employment equity data is driven by total population. There is a new table in the report that presents Saint Mary’s data using two methodologies that are explained in a new Appendix B at the end of the 2013 report. There are also new tables presenting survey information. Based on the Federal Employment Equity Act Guidelines, relative to the survey respondents at Saint Mary’s University, members of visible minorities and aboriginals are underrepresented.

- ii) 2014 Report on ‘Positive Action To Improve The Employment Of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible Minorities And People With Disabilities’, *Appendix D*.

**Key discussion points:**

- Some of the front end of this report is similar to the previous year’s report.
- This report is mandated by the SMUFU Collective Agreement. There is no mandate to report to the Federal Government because we do not hold a contract for goods and services tax to the amount that we would be required to report to them.
- The second page refers to an employment equity employment survey. The university conducted two surveys in recent years. One was for full-time faculty in 2013 and the second was for part time faculty done in 2014. At total of 923 full-time and regular part-time employees were surveyed with 702 responses. Of those surveyed, 477 self-identified as a member of one of the four specified groups.
- Most gaps are considered not to be significant under the guidelines. Positive actions that have been taken are summarized on page 7, 8 & 9 of the report.
- Members noted that this is a significant improvement over the first two years of reporting. There is still an issue in terms of articulating what our goals are. The reports have identified a few significant issues related to minorities. Question: Where are the goals and the activities proposed to address those gaps? Answer: There are three issues: 1) consultation process – the departments believe there needs to be a better process. 2) Academic Units and 3) reasonable goals. In recognitions of these weakness, the administration wants to address these through a consultation with the academic units.
- Appreciation was expressed for the effort that went into this report. During the hiring process, the report states that there is assistance available with the process. Question: What help is available? Answer: This is outlined in the collective agreement and usually takes the form of a search committee within the Department. There is an obligation on the

part of the employer to be proactive and provide guidance at the front-end of the process.

There being no further questions or objections, the revised 2013 report and the 2014 reports are approved as submitted.

- .02 Geology Program Review Documentation – *Appendix E* – Notice of Motion, *Appendix F* – Recommendation/Response Comparison, *Appendix G* - Self Study Report, *Appendix H*- Self Study Appendices (1-8), *Appendix I* - Deans Response to Self Study, *Appendix J* - External Review Committee’s (ERC) Final Report, *Appendix K* - Department Response to ERC Report, *Appendix L* - Dean’s Response to ERC report.

**Key discussion points:**

- Question: Clarification was requested on recommendation one under “to be addressed by the Department of Geology and Science Faculty”. Answer: The reviewers were recommending that the Department of Geology and the Environmental Science program build greater connections between them.
- Question: What is the role of Geology in Environmental Science? Answer: Some students may wish to pursue the highly strategic Environmental Geology professional registration in Canada. Geology courses like Environmental Impact Assessment and Green Chemistry apply.
- Question: Recommendation 2 – states “This would require a minimum of 4-5 new part-time faculty in order to cover the range of subject areas taught by those full-time faculty.” What is the sustainability of relying on part-time faculty in a program where there are external accreditation processes? Answer: Part-time faculty are teaching core courses. The situation is not sustainable at this time.
- Question: What is APC recommending in terms of recommendations 1, 2, & 6? Answer: APC is asking Senate to approve these recommendation for implementation by the Department. The second motion is for an Action Plan to identify how the department plans to do that.
- A member suggested that the first two recommendations do not read as recommendations for implementation. The recommendation should be that further discussion should be undertaken by the department. Answer: There are three steps to this program review process. The next step is the action plan and the following one is the one-year follow-up report. The department will be reporting on their progress in terms of the ERC recommendations.

The following motions were presented.

Moved by Gauthier, and seconded, **“that the Geology Program respond to the recommendations of the external reviewers as articulated in the Dean’s response dated April, 2014 and specifically recommends that the Department implement recommendations 1, 2, and 6 for implementation by the Program as presented in the ERC report section “to be addressed by the Department of Geology and Science Faculty”. Motion carried**

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **“that the Geology Program submit an action plan to APC in February 2015.” Motion carried**

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **“that in December, 2015, the Geology Program submit a one-year report to the Academic Planning Committee on the progress made during the year on the Action Plan according to Section 5**

**of the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary's University.”  
Motion carried.**

14034

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

a) Curriculum Semi-Annual Report attached as *Appendix M*

**Key discussion points:**

- A spelling mistake was noted on page 12 in 4453 Taxation – Part I ``minimum``
- Question: There are a lot of new courses. Does the committee review this situation in terms of whether there are any courses that are being deleted? Answer: We do advise the departments when we remove courses from the calendar that have not been taught for five years.

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the report of the Curriculum Committee is approved for insertion into the 2015-2016 Academic Calendar.” Motion carried.**

b) Academic Planning

i. APC Notice of Motion attached as *Appendix N*, 2012-2014 Annual Report, Centre for the Study of Sport and Health (CSSH), attached as *Appendix O*.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- A senator suggested that it might be helpful if items from past years were not repeated in the annual report. Answer: There are a number of ongoing activities that have been updated. Last year we went through a review and we did not submit an annual report so this report covers two years.
- Question: Is there room for curriculum development? Answer: We had a meeting early today and discussed this topic. We are hoping for participation from the Faculties in this process. The intention is to develop initial and intermediate capstone courses. There was exceptional interest in this at the meeting today.
- Under the Senate By-laws, research institutes can initiate academic programs and there is a precedent. A centre can initiate programs.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **``that the Senate accept the 2012-2014 Annual Report of the Centre for the Study of Sport and Health (CSSH) as meeting the requirement of section 3.2 of the Senate Policy 8-1009, Senate By-Laws Governing the Establishment, Reporting and Review of Research Institutes and Centres at Saint Mary's.`` Motion carried.**

ii. APC Notice of Motion attached as *Appendix P*, English Program Review – one-year follow-up report attached as *Appendix Q*.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Question: Have the problems with the prerequisites been addressed?  
Answer: In the academic calendar there were global requirements for these courses. The Senate Curriculum Committee questioned why we would get a course submitted at the fourth-year level without a prerequisite. The curriculum committee noticed the global statement and decided to apply this to all the courses in the unit. The department decided that this global statement was not a prerequisite but only a guideline and wanted it removed. The Curriculum Committee will be revisiting this issue when their review of submissions is complete. This issue is not just related to the English Department.
- Question: Is there any adjustment being made in terms of the 4000 level courses that are being made a 2000 level course? Answer: The department is reconsidering the program at this time.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, ``**that the Senate accept the on-year follow-up report as meeting the requirements of Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs at Saint Mary's.**`` Motion carried.

- iii. APC Notice of Motion attached as *Appendix R*, MPHEC Proposal for a PhD in Applied Science, attached as *Appendix S* and appendices attached as *Appendix T*.

Key Discussion Points:

- On page 13 of the proposal it indicates that there are no additional human or physical resources needed to support this program. In terms of course releases it works out to 2 full time equivalent faculty members that are required. Question: Where are these resources coming from? Answer: When MPHEC considers resources they are thinking about buildings and space. There will be a compensating decrease in the size of the M.Sc. program to off-set the resource demand. MPHEC want to know how many new faculty resources will be necessary and we are not planning to increase faculty resources.
- In 4.1.3 you mention part-time teaching. You cannot keep expanding the part-time component without limit. Response: There is a huge amount of course releases for research and there will be a trade-off there. It is difficult to trade off one-for-one. This is something that will benefit faculty and students and there will be motivation to work this out.
- Commerce has a situation where further demands on resources would be unmanageable. Science could find themselves in this same situation.
- The Master Program is an umbrella interdisciplinary program. Question: Is this PhD program also interdisciplinary? Answer: It is not specifically an interdisciplinary program.
- This is our fifth PhD Program to come before Senate. The proposal work started in July of 2006. During the last program review, one of the strong recommendations from the External Reviewers was to develop a Ph.D. program. There will be competition from some of our sister institutions in the Maritimes.

- Master students in this program want to become Ph.D. students. Question: Could the Masters and Ph.D. students take courses together? Answer: On page 6, paragraph 3 the proposal addresses that question. This is an efficiency. We have identified the core courses and there will be opportunity for the participation of the Ph.D. students in terms of integrating these two group of students.
- Concerned was expressed in relation to how the Master students become Ph.D. students. There is a high risk in terms of students completing their Master program. Answer: We have precedent in two other Ph.D. programs. Astronomy has a process for transitioning from the Master to the Ph.D. If a student got into the Ph.D. without completing the Master, they can drop the Ph.D. and reevaluate the requirements that have been met in terms of the Master.
- At some point, given the fiscal realities, we need to decide what we want to do and cut away what we do not want to do. We cannot just keep adding programs and courses.
- The Department of Psychology is involved in the Applied Science program but it is not mentioned in this proposal. Question: Why? Answer: The idea is not to provide reason for arguments against the program. We can address this at a later date.
- When the Ph.D. proposal went through the APC it was noted that it wasn't in the current format for MPHEC. MPHEC has been contacted in this regard and there were three gaps which we have addressed and corrected. There were very minor corrections.

Moved by Vessey and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the MPHEC Proposal for a Ph.D. in Applied Science for submission to MPHEC.” Motion carried**

- c) Learning and Teaching Committee. Annual Report attached as ***Appendix U***  
There being no objection the report was accepted into the Senate record.

- d) Literacy Strategy Committee

- i. Annual Report attached as ***Appendix V***

***Key Discussion Points:***

- The committee has struggled with their mandate but are very pleased with the opportunities that will arise from the report of the University-wide Assessment of ENGL 1205 Committee.

There being no objection the report was accepted into the Senate record.

- ii. Academic Literacy Definition, attached as Appendix W1 Memo and W2 Definition.

**Key discussion points:**

- The asterisk and related text should go to the top of the page with the Sentence starting ‘Academic literacy’. Much of the context in the text that is presented is submitted with the permission of the University of Essex.
- The submitted text of the definition was presented on the board.

- The key here is that the definition that the Literacy Strategy was to develop was supposed to be as described or related to the working definition presented in the final report of the Committee for the Assessment of ENGL 1205. Clearly the definition that has been presented is not as described in the motion from the Senate. We have both an opportunity and obligation to say more than the borrowed minimum.
- Academic literacies are the skills, competencies, practices and attitudes needed to learn and communicate knowledge and meaning in a broad range of contexts in the pursuit of higher learning. They require a necessary fundamental level of language proficiency to engage in post-secondary reading and writing, and are therefore built upon fundamental academic skills. Academic literacies are acquired, practiced, and progressively developed as the student advances through the university degree program, responding to articulated expectations of increasingly higher-order thinking and specialization in the discipline. Opportunities for the acquisition and development of academic literacies are necessarily embedded in the design and structure of the university degree program. Academic literacies are not only inherent elements of academic study and research, but the skills, competencies, practices and attitudes of academic literacies are at the core of student intellectual development, pursuit of lifelong learning, full participation in employment, and meaningful civic engagement in society.
- The Essex bullets list skills but they are not consistent. For example knowledge is not a skill. Independent learning does fall under the umbrella of academic literacy. These are misplaced elements in a list of academic literacies.
- They require a necessary fundamental level of language proficiency to engage in post-secondary reading and writing, and are therefore built upon fundamental academic skills. This is an important sentence to point out the fact that resources are needed for students who discover they are not ready to achieve their potential and to avoid misinterpretations by those less familiar with the definition of academic literacies.
- It is unfortunate that the Senate Committee on Literacy Strategy has found nothing useful in the final report of the assessment committee. It has borrowed the bullet points from University of Essex to use as a list of academic literacies. The definition is not a good fit with the work that was done over the 10 months that the assessment committee examined institutional practices and peer-reviewed information on the subject of Academic Literacies.
- The University of Essex states that this definition is working well. The goals are very lofty. How do they measure success? If this is working for Essex we would like to see evidence. Answer: The Literacy Strategy Chair advised that the committee did not know how Essex was measuring success.

- Question: Did the committee consider the work of the Assessment Committee? Answer: Yes the English 1205 discourse was presented to the committee. The Literacy Strategy Committee struggled with how to take that and put it into a framework that would not be prescriptive within their Faculties. That is why the proposed definition is as broad as it is. The committee was also concerned with brevity.
  - The working group needed to have this parameter in order to do their work.
  - The logic of the simple definition is understandable but the submission is too simple and it is missing key information.
  - It was suggested that there should be consultation meeting between the Working Group that is to use the definition and the Literacy Strategy Committee to attempt a collaborative effort on a definition.
- e) Research Ethics Board, revised Senate Policy on Ethical Conduct for Research involving Humans, attached as *Appendix X*.
- Key discussion points:**
- Defer to February and Dr Cameron will be invited to attend.

14035

**NEW BUSINESS FROM**

- a. Floor (not involving notice of Motion)  
 Question: When is the report from the Academic Discipline Committee going to be submitted? Answer: Soon. The letter is with Paul Dixon.

14036

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Dr Dodd presented the following:

- The action team report for December will be ready for next week.
- The Loretta Saunders Scholarship Award Criteria
  - Scholarships will be open to female students enrolled at the University in good academic standing and who can demonstrate a record of community service to First Nations.
  - One scholarship is external and one is internal.
  - There was a significant donation from SMUSA for this scholarship. We will make the first award this spring.

14037

**QUESTION PERIOD**

- No questions.

14038

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 P.M.

Barb Bell,  
 Secretary to the Office of Senate