

SENATE MEETING MINUTES
April 13, 2018

The 592nd Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, April 13, 2018, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom.

PRESENT: Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr Butler, Dr Bradshaw, Dr Smith, Dr VanderPlaat, Dr Francis, Dr Grandy, Dr Hlongwane, Dr Khokhar, Dr Rahaman, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr Warner, Dr Twohig, Mr Brophy, Mr Webster, Mr Nasrallah, Ms Ali, Sk Mahmudur Rahman Shovon, Ms Bhaskar, Mr Oshobu, Dr Enns, Dr Crooks, Ms Sargeant Greenwood and Ms Bell, Secretary of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr Naulls, Dr MacDonald, Dr Sarty, Dr Doucet, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Hall, Dr Loughlin, Dr McCallum, Dr Peckmann, and Ms Caswell.

Meeting commenced at 2:36 P.M, Dr VanderPlaat presided. The incoming VP Academic of SMUSA was introduced: Sk Mahmudur Rahman Shovon. Mr Nasrallah has been reelected as SMUSA President.

17072 **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**
The agenda was accepted.

17073 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
Minutes of the meeting of March 16, 2018, were circulated as *Appendix A*.

Moved by Takseva, and seconded, **'that the minutes of the meeting of March 16, 2018 are approved as circulated.'** Motion carried.

17074 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**
None.

17075 **OUTSTANDING ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS**
.01 Learning and Teaching Committee – revised terms of reference, *Appendix B1, B2 & B3* (Drs Enns and Crooks)
Key Discussion Items:

- Crooks advised that the revisions were done in December. In January, we were asked to reconsider the document and decided that the document should stand as it is.
- The committee was asked to look at the structure of the Studio and this Senate Committee in terms of how they interacted. There is some cross over in activities. One unique issue is the budget, which this committee disperses to our faculty related to teaching and/or conference grants, and plans for

workshops and visiting speakers. We review proposals and disperse funds accordingly. Our members also mentor faculty in this regard. We also provide a workshop, which is internationally recognized. We work in concert with the Studio, Dalhousie regarding funding and some comes from our budget as well. This committee arranges communities of practice, which is a function that the Studio also does. This is educational leadership lead by faculty for faculty.

- Question: On page 5 of the report under item number three it specifies four faculty members, one from each of: Arts, Sobey School of Business, Science and Graduate Studies and Research. Can you confirm that still to be valid? Answer: Yes, it is confirmed.
- Enns advised that Senate requested background information to clarify the context and background for this committee development. The committee has supported teaching and learning for 50 years on campus. There was a past request for a teaching centre but it was not possible at that time. Instead this committee was formed. There has been a movement toward developing teaching centers within universities. With the current situation, there seems to be situations where the committee works collaboratively and some in which they work in parallel. An appeal was made to the Senate to make a structural and formal link between the faculty and the Studio. The Committee does not work this way. The Studio does not have an advisory committee that works with the Studio staff to link with the faculty.
- Crooks supported this idea. The link between the Studio and the Senate Committee has not yet been established. There is no reason why this committee could not operate in an advisory capacity to the Studio.
- Question: Do we need another committee? Answer: The current committee could do that work. Several time a year, we could meet collaboratively with the Studio to pursue initiatives.
- The section 5.2.13.5 mentions working collaboratively and this is a first step towards this.
- There are resources provided within offices to provide for faculty support. The Studio can also provide support for these initiatives. The ideal would be to work collaboratively. This TOR provides some clarity around this relationship.
- If this committee were to do this role, would they continue to be a committee of Senate and have senators on their membership, or should this change? Answer: The committee does not see itself as the intermediary between Senate and the Studio. We can report on what we observe but our primary function is not to do that. The committee would continue to provide leadership but act strategically in an advisory capacity where it makes sense.
- Concern – this committee is doing governance, leadership, and management at the same time. This is a very confusing mandate for a committee. In regard to this committee`s role in operations, Question: Where is the governance and where is the big picture of teaching and learning within our institution? There are so many big questions that we need to address. Where is the governance to bring those questions to Senate?
- This committee should be bringing these questions to Senate but that hasn`t happened. This committee needs to take ownership of the awards. This is not a function that should be done by the Studio.

- There is a policy function and an operations function within the Senate Committee. There is also a certain amount of operation functions within the Studio.
- The awards could be reviewed and decided and then the Studio would be responsible for the awarding process.
- This committee is the only body that represents faculty voices on campus and is the only vehicle to bring that feedback into Senate. An example would be the roll out of Brightspace. This Senate Committee could have been the conduit for that issue.
- Question: What would the committee have done in this situation? Answer: The committee would have deliberated on the problem and then approached the studio to find a resolution.
- Going forward, we need to be more explicit to the broader community about how the support structures work and provide support to faculty as a pathway to work together. It was suggested that this is a communications issue versus something related to the terms of reference. The question is; does the terms of reference provide the clarity for this Senate Committee?
- A clause could be included that clarifies to faculty that the committee could act as a voice for faculty. An important revision might be to be more explicit that the committee is a faculty-led group, while the Studio is a support administrative unit.
- If there were specific revisions to the language, it would be helpful to know what those need to be.
- Under 5.2.14.8 - the composition of the committee needs to be edited in regard to titles - 2, 3, 6 and 9 need to be revised and the numbering needs to be revised because there is no number 8.
- Revise 5.2.14.8 number 2 from ``a representative from the Teaching and Learning Studio`` to ``a representative from **The Studio for Teaching and Learning**``.
- Revise 5.2.14.8 number 3: A **faculty** member from each of the four faculties.
- Revise 5.2.14.8 number 6 should read: One student ~~nominated~~ **appointed** by **the Student Association SMUSA**;
- Revise 5.2.14.8 number 9 should be numbered 8 and read: **Associate Vice-President, Teaching and Learning** ~~Senior Advisor, Teaching and Learning~~ (ex officio)
- Revise 5.2.14.8 number 10 – It should be numbered **9**.
- Further discussion was deferred to May pending a resubmission.

17076

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

.01 Academic Planning Committee

- a) Accounting Program - ***Appendix C1*** - APC Notice of Motion, ***Appendix C2*** - 1-year program review follow-up report, ***Appendix C3*** - Recommendation-Comparison summary.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the one-year follow-up report of the Accounting Program Review as meeting the requirements of Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs at Saint Mary’s.” Motion carried.**

- b) Physics Program - *Appendix D1* - APC Notice of Motion, *Appendix D2* - 1-year program review follow-up report, *Appendix D3* - Recommendation-Comparison summary

Key Discussion Items:

- Question: page one of four - recommendation one - There was a concern that the undergraduate program was being neglected, and that first year courses were being taught by part-timers. The undergraduate program seemed to have taken a backseat to the graduate program (in terms of attention/time/teaching by full-time faculty). Can you clarify what has taken place between then and now to address this perception? Answer: Smith advised that the department has done a fundamental review of their curriculum. There is a shift that is happening in terms of addressing this issue.
- Members were advised that there has been a delay in the search for an open faculty position for this program.
- Question: Do they have a greater number of faculty teaching first year courses? Answer: There is a lot of flux in the department. There are only nine members; one is a new hire, another position is close to being filled and another is open at this time.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the one-year follow-up report of the Physics Program Review as meeting the requirements of Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs at Saint Mary’s.” Motion carried.**

- c) History Program - *Appendix E1* - APC Notice of Motion, *Appendix E2* - 1-year program review follow-up report, *Appendix E3* - Recommendation-Comparison summary

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the one-year follow-up report of the History Program Review as meeting the requirements of Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs at Saint Mary’s.” Motion carried.**

- d) Management Undergraduate program review documentation – *Appendix F* - Notice of Motion, *Appendix G* – Recommendation-Comparison summary, *Appendix H* - Self Study Report, *Appendix I* - Self Study appendices (1-7), *Appendix J* – Dean’s Response to Self Study, *Appendix K1* - External Review Committee’s (ERC) Final Report, *Appendix K2* - External Review Appendix. **Please note:** the Department Response to ERC Report and the Dean’s Response to ERC report are inserted directly into Appendix G.

Key Discussion Items:

- **Recommendation 1** Senate agrees with the response of the program and the Dean but do not feel that we need to wait for the upcoming review for the General Business major in fall 2018 to develop a Management Major that better meets student needs and the mission of the Sobey School of Business.
- **Recommendation 2** Senate looks forward to the results of the deliberations of the program.
- **Recommendation 3** Senate agrees with the recommendation of the reviewers in principle, but recognizes that the AACSB standards

related to accreditation will assure the continued development of outcomes within the B. Comm., which will satisfy recommendation three.

- **Recommendation 4** Senate will review its grouping of majors within each department in the scheduling of program reviews and agrees with the Dean's response.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Management Undergraduate Program submit an action plan to Academic Planning Committee in June, 2018 based on the responses above.” Motion carried.**

and

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that in April, 2019, the Management Undergraduate Program submit a one-year report to the Academic Planning Committee on the progress made on the Action Plan according to Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary's University.” Motion carried.**

17077

PROFESSOR EMERITUS RECOMMENDATIONS

Nominations for Professor Emeritus status: *Appendix L* - Professor Nicola Young, Department of Accounting, and *Appendix M* - Dr. Brian Bartlett, Department of English

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the awarding of Professor Emerita to Professor Nicola Young, Department of Accounting.” Motion carried.**

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the awarding of Professor Emeritus to Dr Brian Bartlett, Department of English.” Motion carried.**

17078

NEW BUSINESS FROM

- a) Floor (not involving notice of motion)
- Gift Acceptance Policy, *Appendix P1 and P2* (Ms Sargeant Greenwood)
Key Discussion Items:
 - This is a tool to evaluate potential gifts and recognize any risks of gifts. We want to ensure that the gifts we accept further the purpose, objectives, values and priorities of our University and the Strategic Plan. We also want to ensure transparency and clearly identify who is authorized to accept a gift on behalf of the University.
 - This policy is not intended to govern all things around the Office of Advancement. This is the first of a number of policies that will be brought forward to govern advancement at Saint Mary's. There will be a set of guidelines and a procedures document behind each of these documents.
 - There will be a number of benefits: discipline & focus, clear roles and responsibilities, a high level of awareness of the issues and strong and transparent decision making.

- Our key elements are the principles governing gift acceptance, authority and authorization, fundraising priorities, seeking of professional advice and transparency.
- A slide with a work plan was shown with Board approval being the last step and anticipated on April 27, 2018.
- This policy is a foundational piece that allows us to process transformational donations for the university.
- Question: How were we managing this before now? Answer: We had some very capable people in oversight over this process. The size of the donations and the risk related to that process has become a concern and a policy has become necessary.
- Question: Is there a consultation process to determine if a gift is appropriate? Section four states that the BOG is delegated with the responsibility for approving gifts of \$2 million or more and the President and Vice-Chancellor have the authority to make decisions on gifts in excess of \$250,000 and less than 2 million. What is the requirement to consult on any situation? Answer: This is a work in process. There are procedural things in place that require the appropriate signatures before a gift is accepted. There are so many unique procedural issues around the types of gifts, but the signature of the President is always the last signature needed before accepting any gift.
- Question: The Library has a number of situations where they must turn down gifts. Tax receipts have also become an issue. Does the Library retain their oversight? Answer: Yes. That is why the procedures behind these documents become so important.
- Question: Within the policy, is there any reference to the public good? Sometimes something that is good for the University is not in the best interests of the public. An example would be bequeathing a piece of property to the University. The university sells it for the best interests of the University and that may not necessarily be in the best interests of the neighborhood. Answer: This is part of the reason we put the introduction in place with reference to serving the community. We talk about the highest standard of ethical conduct in the community and in all of our external relationships and interactions. We look at whether acceptance of gifts were self-serving and whether they are in the best interests of our community. We would also continually review to identify where to improve the procedures.
- If we accept a gift and then realize that it is not in the best interest of the University, what do we do? Answer: Should this gift pose a risk to the university, we retain the right to break the agreement.
- The process is also subject to freedom of information requests.
- Question: Do we have a policy for returning gifts? Answer: We do not have a policy. We have a statement about the university's right to break the agreement. We have the right to keep the money and not meet the terms of the agreement (there is precedent for this at other universities).
- Question: Is there a guideline document yet to come that shows how the policy will be enacted? Answer: Yes. More clarity is needed, but currently Ms Sergeant Greenwood sees all gift agreements until these documents are in place. They should be in place within a year.

- There is a requirement in the policy to provide a list of all gifts over \$5,000 to the Board of Governors and to Senate at least annually.
- b) Registration opened on March 3 and we still do not have an academic calendar. The situation is unacceptable.
- This is a serious issue for the Faculty of Arts related to significant changes in some Arts program.
 - The Senate Office advised that some issues delayed the Registrar from publishing the calendar.
 - Strong concern was expressed on the impact to students attempting to register and chart their program course into next term. These students are being seriously impacted.
 - When the prerequisites change, students cannot register in those courses.
 - We hold our students to academic regulations in the calendar and point to it as the official document of the university. If we do not make it available to students in a timely fashion, we are sending terribly mixed messages to them.
 - Caution was expressed related to the fact that this is a legal document and it has to be accurate.
 - It was suggested that Senate establish a date by which the calendar must be published and available. We should not be accepting registrations if we cannot post the calendar.
 - The calendar process needs to be reviewed and revised to provide for a timelier outcome. The VPAR agreed to take this issue up with the Registrar
- c) Update on the Sub-Committee to examine and report on the feasibility of implementing the models presented in the Cross Faculty Working Group on Academic Literacy Report and Recommendations to Senate on the first year learning)
- Members were advised that there were discussions held at the faculty councils related to this work that have delayed the report back to the Senate.
 - Members were advised that the October Senate minutes record that the committee was supposed to report to Senate in November 2017. This was delayed because of the consultations with the various Faculties. Efforts will be made to have this group meet before the next Senate meeting to report to Senate in May.
- d) The role of AVP on Teaching and Learning.
- A member asked why filling the position of AVP of Teaching and Learning was handled in the manner in which it was. It wasn't posted and no search was done. The member noted that following comments and question were entirely about process and collegiality – they are not meant to be personal
 - Senate is responsible for the educational policy of the University. The AVP of Teaching and Learning would be instrumental in that effort. The opportunity to serve in that important role should be accessible and open to anyone interested in competing for that position; it should not fall into a loophole simply because it has an “A” before VP. It is understood that

technically, this practice does not contravene the SMUFU collective agreement, but it potentially contravenes the values of collegiality and transparency and fairness.

- Students should care about this, as it will affect them (more in the long run rather than in the short run). Saint Mary's University should care about their image to students, the community, and prospective students. Students should expect that the most qualified candidate is selected for this important role; not appointed. This is not a personal statement about the faculty member currently in this position. It is about the process.
- Saint Mary's should care about its image to faculty. Attracting and retaining good faculty is important, and practices like this create distrust and disillusion among faculty and possibly other administrators. We have top-notch, highly distinguished educators at SMU who might have wanted an opportunity to compete to serve the University community as AVP of Teaching and Learning. It's demoralizing and not collegial.
- The hope is that this practice stop immediately and that Saint Mary's embrace a transparent, fair and collegial approach to such appointments.
- Several members suggested that the sentiments expressed were shared across faculties. Response: Members were advised that for the sake of clarity, this was only a change in title and not an appointment.
- Question: If this is only a change in title, why was it necessary? Answer: To indicate that the positions of VPAR and Assoc. VP Teaching and Learning are parallel.
- Member's Comment: It was understood that the VP Teaching & Learning would report to VPAR, if the positions are parallel then that is a change of policy.
- A member noted that a full search and interview process was conducted to fill the position of Associate Vice President Research. A title change/addition to AVP Research was more palatable given that it was linked to an academic position for which there was a proper search for the most suitable candidate. That didn't happen for the appointment to AVP Teaching & Learning. The title is not linked to an academic appointment. The Associate Vice President, Teaching and Learning role should be filled through an open search process.
- Question: Will this individual join Senate? Answer: This is the decision of Senate. The Senior Advisor, Teaching and Learning has not been a member on Senate.
- It was suggested that it was important that any appointment to a position in Learning and Teaching should be transparent and fair. It would be in the best interests of the university.

e) Floor (involving notice of motion)

- Revisions to Senate Policies – **Appendix N1** Notice of Motion, **Appendix N2** - Dean Emeritus and **Appendix N3** Senate Policy – Professor Emeritus

Key Discussion Items:

- Recently, a gap was identified in the procedure for awarding emeritus status. To address this gap, it is proposed to inserted text at the beginning of the third paragraph under Procedures to both the Dean Emeritus and the Professor Emeritus Senate Policies to identify the process after approval by the Board of Governors.

- A revision was suggested to add ``Advancement Office`` to the list of ccs. The mover accepted this revision.
- The following text is to be inserted at the beginning of the third paragraph under Procedures in 8-1001 Senate Policy – Professor Emeritus, and in 8-1002 Senate Policy – Dean Emeritus:
“The President’s Office will notify the faculty member by letter (cc to Senate Office, Advancement Office, and the Registrar) of the decision of the Board of Governors. The Registrar’s Office will contact the faculty member to arrange for the formal award at a convenient convocation ceremony”

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the revision to the Senate Policy - Dean Emeritus and the Senate Policy – Professor Emeritus as submitted.” Motion carried.**

f) Incidents of disruptive had harassing behavior

There was a ad-hoc committee set up last year to review racism on campus. The committee has met and very soon, there will be a report being brought forward to Senate. There has been a recent increase in incidents of disruptive and harassing behavior on the part of individuals and groups of students directed toward individual faculty members. The Dean of Arts Office has documented this. In light of this disturbing trend, a motion is being proposed.

Key Discussion Items:

- Question: What is the data on recent incidents? Answer: This is a qualitative assessment. The Associate Dean of Arts has had a number of faculty members have come forward during his short term in office with incidents that have happened both in and out of the classroom. In discussing this with the Director of Student Services, they identified a gap within the classroom environment. We may need a policy for things that disrupt the learning environment.
- Question: Are we only concerned about student’s misbehavior toward faculty? If we are going to do this, we need to look at faculty misbehavior towards students. Answer: The reason for the motion is that we want the group to be able to address other forms of harassment.
- We do have regulations and conduct expectations that apply within the classroom. We have held students and faculty to account in this regard in the past. Response: We have regulations but they are not put into practice. Faculty can have a student removed from a classroom but this has seldom been applied at this university. If faculty are worried about the consequences of such an action, the regulation is not as effective as is needed. There is an escalation of these types of events at many universities globally.
- The Student Services representative advised members that they are conscious of the blurred lines between behavioral issues and racism. The ad hoc committee was not charged to create policies. Caution was suggested related to broadening the task of the committees to create policies. There is an existing due process to protect the student from a situation where the instructor just does not like the student.
- Members were advised that the existing wording does not prevent the committee from creating policy.

- Students expressed concern about the accountability of the faculty member in cases where there are issues related to faculty behavior.
- Members were advised that a number of disruptions in the classroom might be related to a health management issue. This is a complex situation and care is necessary in our approach.
- Disruption related to health management requires different responses and procedures. Members were advised that the student code of conduct is being revised to address these types of issues. The ad hoc committee is not addressing those issues. A suggestion was to include counselling sessions as part of the response where health management issues were involved.
- Question: What consultations are done in these situations? Answer: We consult with the Deans, faculty involved, conflict resolution, etc. These cases come up very quickly and they have many moving parts. There are many challenges in dealing with them. We are in conversations related to how to create an optimal environment to address these situations.
- An amendment to the motion was proposed: Insert ``and out of`` in front of the word `classroom`. The mover accepted this amendment.
- Question: Is the word `formulate` in the motion the correct word to use? The word `review` was suggested. The mover accepted this amendment. With this emendment, the motion does not articulate that the ad hoc committee must develop a policy.
- Faculty members, who are faced with these situations and the toxic environments that are created, are discouraged and afraid to the point where they consider quitting. They can be intimidated and their ability to teach is negatively impacted.
- The existing policies appear to be failing to address the existing situation. Unfortunately, we only have anecdotal evidence of the situation. We need data on these incidents and how well the existing policies and regulations are dealing with these incidents.
- A member suggested that they were not comfortable with the motion. The committee should be focusing on racism only. This motion may dilute the issue of racism. Response: Racist behavior is being disruptive. We are not attempting to dilute the issue of racism through this motion. This motion is to allow the existing ad hoc committee to consider the issue in its full capacity.
- We are speaking about behavioral disruptions that are clearly motivated by racism.
- A member expressed concern related to forming policies around behavior specifically related to racism. Question: Would only the behavior stemming from racist issues fall under these policies and other types of behavior would fall under other policies? Answer: Yes.
- Students reiterated their concern about situations where the racist behavior comes from the faculty member. The committee needs to look at both situations.
- Question: Is there a student on this ad hoc committee? Answer: Yes.
- Vote was 11 for, none against and 4 abstentions.

Moved by Takseva, and seconded, **“that the Ad-Hoc Committee established to address elements of racism on campus and led by Tom**

Brophy, meet to address the multiplicities of racism on campus and expand its mandate by looking at how racism intersects with other forms of exclusions, discrimination and harassment in and out of the classroom, and review formulate policies and regulations on disruptive behavior affecting the learning environment.”

17079

PRESIDENTS REPORT

The President`s report was posted on SMUport this morning. Members can refer to the on-line version for further details.

Discovery and Innovation in a Learner-centered environment.

- The province has provided additional funding in the amount of \$192,000 in support of the 2018 Creativity and Innovation Boot camp, under the Post-Secondary Education Sandbox Program.
- There was a sell-out crowd, for Mr. Michael Medline, President and CEO, Sobeys presentation “Defense to Offense: Winning our Own Game”. The event, and Michael’s remarks, demonstrated a constructive and commendable intersection between the business and academic worlds.
- Professor Emeritus Jarda Dostal, Geology, was recognized in a special issue of the International Journal of Earth Sciences. Drs. Laura Weir and Anne Dalziel received a prestigious John R. Evans Leaders Fund award from CFI.
- SMUSA president, Ossama Nasrallah, was recognized this week in the NS Legislature for receiving the Canadian Association of Student Associations’ ‘Future Prime Minister Award’!

Intercultural learning:

- Returned today from facilitating a workshop in Toronto on the recent Global Mobility Report.

Institutional Sustainability:

- Hosted a series of Roundtable sessions in Halifax and in Toronto. Work is continuing with the consulting firm of KCI, as we consider plans that will be transformative for the future of our university.

External Relations and Communications:

- Attended the Public Policy Forum Dinner to hear from honoured Canadians, including Mark Carney, Justice Beverley McLachlan, and Halifax-based Mary Walsh and Michael Donovan.
- Attended the launch of Spritely, the start-up company of alumnus Akram Alotumi, a graduate of our MTEI program. The impact of Saint Mary’s University in contributing to entrepreneurship and business skills was showcased – and there are a number of alumni involved in this company.
- Commended the Senate members for their commitment to Learning and Teaching.

17080

QUESTION PERIOD

- No questions.

17081

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4: 30 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary of Senate