

## **SENATE MEETING MINUTES**

### **December 13, 2019**

The 607<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, December 13, 2019, at 2:00 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr Takseva, Chairperson, presided.

**PRESENT:** Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr Butler, Dr Francis, Dr MacDonald, Dr Sarty, Dr Bannerjee, Dr Brosseau, Dr Collins, Dr De Fuentes, Dr Grandy, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Hanley, Dr McKee, Dr Panasian, Dr Power, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr Twohig, Mr Brophy, Ms Killam, Ms van den Hoogen, Ms Navas, Mr de Chastelain, Ms Klajman, Ms Nankani, Ms Witter, Dr Smith, Ms Sargeant-Greenwood, and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

**REGRETS:** Dr Bhabra, Dr Doucet, and Dr Khokhar

The meeting commenced at 2:05 P.M with Dr Bannerjee chairing and providing the territorial acknowledgement. Dr Takseva resumed the position of chair at 2:15 pm.

**20039**      **REPORT OF AGENDA COMMITTEE**

The Agenda Committee was accepted.

**20040**      **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Report is posted as Appendix A.

**Discovery and Innovation in a Learning-centred environment**

- Chaired by Dr. John Reid (History), a meeting in New Delhi of the Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute Presidents' and Vice-Chancellors' group produced valuable connections for research and teaching. This trip also provided an opportunity to strengthen support for Saint Mary's from Canada's high commission team in India.
- The annual Queen Elizabeth Scholarship program reception was held at Government House, noting the importance of experiential learning for both in-bound and out-bound scholars.

**Intercultural Learning**

- The visit to New Delhi noted above also involved two recruitment events, strengthening Saint Mary's as a study abroad opportunity.

- Board of Governors presentation on the international contexts of international education, outlining key geopolitical trends, changes in approaches across Canada, and situating Saint Mary's.
- At Senate's recommendation, membership of the President's standing committee on racism has been revised, adding a further faculty representative.

### **Institutional Sustainability**

- The Board of Governors met on November 29th, with a primary focus on strategic enrolment management. Dr. Butler provided a comprehensive presentation and Board members continue to provide insight and advice on the significant enrolment challenges faced by the university.
- The budget development for fiscal 2021 has been initiated noting the increased constraints we are facing.

**20041**

## **VICE-PRESIDENT ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH REPORT –**

### ***Appendix B1 (10 min)***

#### **Accessibility Committees**

- Unable to finalize structures (specifically, the certainty to be able to identify the members appropriately) in time for this Senate meeting. Will work to complete the task before year end, and report to Senate in January.

#### **Employment Equity**

- The 2019 report on Positive Action to Improve the Employment of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible Minorities, and People with Disabilities at Saint Mary's University is an agenda item later in this meeting. *As a reminder, it fulfils an obligation under 10.4.8 of the SMUFU collective agreement.*

There has been significant work on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) in hiring. This work was driven by the mandate of the Canada Research Chairs program, but it will hopefully move into a broader discussion on faculty hiring in the context of an Equity Plan. The AVPR and the Diversity and Inclusion Advisor have been working closely on this with the support of an EDI advisory committee.

#### **Strategic Enrolment Management**

- At the last Senate, the VPAR provided further updates on student recruitment and success. All of this is integrated and is known broadly in the university sector as “strategic enrolment management” (SEM). This contrasts with enrolment management, which focused only on the recruitment and admission of students.
- The numbers reported to AAU were presented to Senators.
- SMU retention and graduation rates continue to be amongst the worst in the country: One-year Retention 78.9%; Seven-year Graduation Rate (2011 and 2012 cohorts) 53.5%. A deeper analysis of these statistics is being undertaken to be able to understand the issues.

- SMU is taking the fulsome approach under the umbrella of SEM, by implementing the following:
  1. Engaging all the senior academic leadership, SMUSA leadership, along with support from with key leaders from other offices, in oversight to ensure everyone is working together.
  2. Enhancing our entrance scholarship program to be competitive within NS, also making us more competitive nationally and internationally.
  3. Coordination of recruitment activities across the university, along with a review of marketing and messaging.
  4. A more coordinated approach to conversion (i.e., getting accepted applicants to registration).
  5. Improving our admissions process. This currently is a manual, and thus slow, process. The ability to make decisions will be strengthened in the short term while we begin the project to automate more of the process. First steps on automation will be in place for September 2020, the start of the next recruitment cycle.
  6. Undertake a focused look at program development and renewal, and how we present our programs to potential students. It is important to have academic leadership behind this, and Dr. Peter Twohig has kindly agreed to chair the subcommittee that will work on this.
  7. Enhance existing retention and success activities (e.g., now have focused next steps from the EAB workshop, continued work to extend the first-year seminar pilot (reaching approximately 1000 first-year students next year), early alert systems for students at risk).
  8. Engage existing students more effectively in developing the messages, communications, and mentorship both at recruitment and throughout student life
  9. Making sure we track and analyze the right data and information to inform decision making. This will be an ongoing item in the VPAR`s report in the months and years to come.

### **Academic Plan**

The VPAR has been presenting key elements of the draft academic plan to various groups (Arts Executive was to have been this week but was cancelled due to the power failure). This will be rescheduled, and the Plan will come to Senate as soon after that as possible. The response so far has been positive, with helpful suggestions on clarifying elements. Many elements from the consultations helped form priorities and principles for the SEM plan evolution.

### **Scholarship and Research (see also the Strategic Research Plan)**

- Develop Grant Facilitator role to meaningfully engage and support faculty in their efforts to secure research resources (funding and infrastructure).
- Create a research advisory group to the AVPR to help identify opportunities and issues impacting scholarship and research at SMU.

- Work with communications officers across campus on improving the storytelling and recognition attached to the work going on at SMU.

### **Interdisciplinarity in Both Scholarship and the Classroom**

- SRP consultations identifying emergent themes. Need to provide opportunity to allow persons in those themes to collaborate.
- Engage resources (e.g., Library) that can provide support for use of research tools.
- Review our cross-appointment structure and how it serves to support and/or impede interdisciplinary collaboration.
- Address challenge of co-teaching in interdisciplinary and/or collaborative domains.

### **Intercultural Learning**

- Provide advanced workshop opportunities for faculty and staff.
- Engage student societies in PD and intercultural learning.
- Better reflection of intercultural campus in activities and environment (displays, events).
- Support meaningful collaboration with external partners.
- The work of the Indigenous Student Advisor and the new African Nova Scotian/Black.
- Student and Community Liaison are examples of how to do this.
- Equity plan has a role here, along with a better/deeper understanding of campus diversity.

### **Working with Indigenous Communities**

- Create working group to engage university community on indigenization of curriculum.

### **Support for Indigenous youth**

- Need collaboration with external partners here, also (e.g., MNFC, CMM, MK).
- Transition programming.
- Recruitment materials with focus on services for Indigenous students.
- Indigenous peer mentorship program (modelled on UNBC/SFU/UVic).

### **Key Discussion Points:**

- Question: There was a language difference in the position postings of the African Nova Scotian/Black Student Advisor and Community Liaison (APC) and the Indigenous Student Advisor. The liaison piece is important. Are we providing support for this responsibility inherent in these positions? Answer: The most recent job description was framed around things that were learned in establishing the position of Indigenous Student Advisor. We are going to look further at this situation to identify all the active pieces of the role and address those that are appropriate.

- Brophy advised that both positions were undertaken after significant consultation with the communities involved. The elders wanted the Indigenous Advisor on campus and available for students and not off campus a lot. It may be time for a review of that. For the African Nova Scotian/Black Student Advisor and Community Liaison (APC) it was the reverse situation.
- SMU needs to ensure that both positions serve students. If it is necessary to commit to additional positions to serve in these capacities, the University needs to respond. Suggestion: These positions are to liaise with external representatives connected to the individual community organizations, and relevant provincial bodies. If those community liaisons are used to support the role that may address this requirement to some degree.
- Question: As we head into the holidays, if we have communications with potential students, shouldn't we communicate some information on the increases on scholarships? Answer: The University can certainly do this. That information could be sent out to current applicants before the break to facilitate their decisions.

20042

**SMUSA PRESIDENT'S REPORT** - *Appendix C* (5 min)

**Introduction**

SMUSA is also working closely with Dr Butler relative to student retention and success.

Saint Mary's University promotes accessibility, diversity, and inclusion, but fails to address such values given the lack of supports for transgender, non-binary, and gender non-conforming individuals in our campus community. To better support these individuals, Saint Mary's can begin allowing the use of preferred names.

Students may wish to use a preferred name for several different or combined reasons, such as a transgender or non-binary student wishing to use their preferred gender identity, and/or an international student wishing to use an English Language name and/or students wishing to use a different last name than their legal name for familial reasons.

While the term "preferred name" is often used when discussing this subject, it is more than just a preference. For many people, it is the only name they use and is essential to their identity. This issue is especially important for our transgender, non-binary, and gender non-conforming students, as this will be critical to them having a safe and positive experience on campus.

**Recommendations**

Our recommendation to the University is to adopt a preferred name policy that permits the use of preferred names in any capacity except where it is legally required to use the person's legal name.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- A student Senator advised that two students have advised this year that they withdrew from Saint Mary's because of this issue.
- Members were advised that Banner has a preferred name field, but it does not talk to any of our other systems. We are working with ITSS to identify the outlying systems with which there are issues. The Registrar has discussed this with the Registrar at the MSVU. We are developing a strategy to implement a solution in mid to late January.
- This has been a technical issue with Banner. There is a will to change this situation.

**20043**            **QUESTION PERIOD**  
Addressed above.

**20044**            **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**  
Minutes of the meeting of November 22, 2019, were *circulated* as *Appendix D*.

Moved by Navas, and seconded, **“that the minutes of the meeting of November 22, 2019, are approved as circulated.” Motion carried with one abstention.**

**20045**            **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

.01 Academic Regulation 20 - Letters of Permission (LoP) - Coordination of a report covering LoPs that is bi-directional to facilitate an informed discussion in Senate.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Smith has created the Ad Hoc Group that will be meeting on December 16. A report will be submitted to the Senate in January 2020.

.02 Senate to create an Ad Hoc Committee to review the status of the Faculty of Education and bring forward recommendations to Senate before the end of the 2019-2020 Academic year circulated as Appendix L for this meeting.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- As charged by Senate at the meeting of November 22, 2019, this committee will review the status of the Faculty of Education and make recommendations to Senate on any actions no later than the last meeting of the 2019/20 academic year.
- The committee will look at the background related to how we arrived at the current situation.
- The committee will:
  - Review the recorded intent of the University's governing bodies and administration regarding Education based on recommendations in the Shapiro report and the consolidation of Bed programming in Nova Scotia.
  - Review actions taken by the University's governing bodies and administration around Education in the intervening time.

- Request reports from the Faculty of Education to facilitate this review and understanding of existing programming and activities within the Faculty.
- Consult with those currently involved in Education courses and programming.
- Consider the administrative unit structures used to oversee Education programming in environments similar to that at Saint Mary's.
- Guided by the above, recommend to the Senate the best path forward given the information gathered.
- Members:
  - VPAR (Chair)
  - SMUSA representative
  - Associate Dean FGSR
  - One representative from each line faculty to be designated by the Deans (Arts, Science, Business)
  - One representative with cross-appointment in the Faculty of Education
- Question: How many graduate students are there in the program?  
Answer: There are approximately 10-15. There are also graduate courses that are part of other programs and there are another 10 – 20 students there.
- The VPAR advised that he will take this meeting as Senate's direction to establish this committee.

20046

### **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

a) Academic Planning Committee

- i. CN Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (Dr Sarty) 2019 Annual Report, *Appendix E1* – APC Memo, *Appendix E2* – CNCOHS 2019 Annual Report.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- The center is an excellent model in terms of how centers can function within the SMU.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“the Senate accept the annual report of the Centre for Occupational Health and Safety as meeting the reporting requirements of the Senate Policy 8-1009, Senate By-Laws Governing the Establishment, Reporting and Review of Research Institutes and Centres at Saint Mary's and that CNCOHS be authorized to continue for a further period of five years from the date of review.” Motion carried.**

- ii. Finance Program – APC Memo – *Appendix F1*, 1 Year Report, *Appendix F2*, Senate Summary/Comparison Sheet – *Appendix F3*

**Key Discussion Points:**

- There were delays related to the reporting cycle for this review and this combined Action Plan-One-Year Report is being submitted to the Senate.

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

iii. Sobey School of Business Proposal for a Minor in Entrepreneurship, APC Notice of Motion – *Appendix G1*, Proposal and Preamble – *Appendix G2 & G3*

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Question: This proposal has an extremely broad scope in terms of elective courses. How were the courses identified? Answer: There was a need to provide entrepreneurial content across all faculties. The process has been two years in development. The courses that are included in the proposal were identified through consultation with Science and Arts.
- Members were advised that the minor was addressed in Arts during several meetings. The Departments were engaged to identify courses that may work in this case.
- Concern was expressed regarding the list of science courses. There is a lengthy list of prerequisites for some Science Courses that have been included and this could be problematic.
- Senators were advised that the minor was presented to the Science Curriculum Committee early in the development process. One of the substantial pieces of feedback was the lack of a “capstone” course. The courses that were chosen appeared to be chosen based on the calendar description. This spring we worked through the list of courses and eliminated those that were impossible for assorted reasons. The courses remaining on the list were vetted by the Science Executive. We confirmed that courses for a Minor can be double counted.
- APC discussed this situation, and the desire was to provide pathways in other faculties to provide as many opportunities for students as possible. The academic advisors will need to engage with the students regarding their interest in this Minor. Like all extensive minors there needs to be communication and advising. If that happens, this is workable.
- Concern was expressed related to the broad scope of this program from a pedagogical perspective. There is an argument that every course in the academic calendar might meet at least one of the criteria for inclusion in the program.
- It is not clear if this is an entrepreneurial teaching approach that is being taken or if it is an innovative teaching approach that is needed here. Answer: It is both course content and delivery. With the current program description, there are many courses that would fit.
- Concern was expressed in relation to the ability of the program to deliver the outcomes as articulated in the proposal.
- The selection of courses is an evolutionary issue that would be an ongoing activity depending on experience and whether the courses actually fit.



- The principle and the flexibility of the minor are wonderful. This documentation evidence a very flexible program development. In terms of the overall value of the program, this has significant potential.
- Making this minor accessible across the University is the problem. The path for some students to get this minor is easier than others. Response: More work will need to be done as the program develops. As instructors express their wish to be involved in the program, they will make revisions in their courses that will provide clear linkages.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the Proposal for a Minor in Entrepreneurship.” Motion carried with two abstentions.**

b) Academic Regulations Committee

- i. Graduate and Undergraduate Academic Regulations revisions (Dr Smith - Sarty), *Appendix H1* – Notice of Motion, *Appendix H2* – Proposed AR revisions.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- On page 1, the revision is to refer to the Academic Forgiveness Policy that is addressed later in this meeting. It was suggested that the Senate consider this item before addressing the Academic Regulations. Consensus was to move to that item at this point in the meeting.
- The revisions on pages 2-3-4 are to remove the references to the Certificate of Instrument Analysis. This program has not been active for a couple of years.
- The Graduate Academic Regulations begin on page 5. These are changes related to actual practice and to allow the focus on the last two years of the degree.
- Question: Academic Regulation 1 c states twenty courses and it should say ``60 credit hours or equivalent``. This amendment to the regulation was accepted.
- Academic Regulation 13 a - LOP were processed by the undergraduate Deans but in recent years it has been the FGSR Dean`s Office that does the processing.
- On page 7 there is an addition to the table following Academic Regulation 20. We are adding the IMTE program to the minimum-maximum table. This should have happened two years ago.
- There are also revisions related to fee changes and leaves of absence, but these are just to remove references to Section 4. This section no longer exists in the Graduate Academic Calendar.

Moved as an omnibus motion by Smith, and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the revisions as presented in Appendix H2 with the revision as indicated above to Academic Regulation 1 c.” Motion carried.**

- ii. Proposal for a Senate Policy on Academic Forgiveness (Dr Smith), *Appendix I1* – Notice of Motion, *Appendix I2* – Senate Policy on Academic Forgiveness.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- We have created a situation where a student who does poorly in their first program and then comes back a couple of years later is at a disadvantage. These students are better off going to another University where they can use transfer credits and do not have to carry the poorer grades forward.
- Senators were advised that all the grades will still appear on transcripts.
- Question: How many might notice this? Answer: 1-20 per year but it is hard to know.

Moved by Smith and seconded, **“that Senate approves the Senate Policy on Academic Forgiveness, as presented in Appendix I2.” Motion carried.**

- c) Curriculum Committee, semi-annual report, attached as: ARC Notice of Motion - *Appendix J1*, Arts Curriculum Report – *Appendix J2*, Commerce Curriculum Report – *Appendix J3*, Science Curriculum Report – *Appendix J4*, and FGSR Curriculum Report – *Appendix J5*.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Question: ANTH has seven new courses without archiving or deleting courses. Answer: These new courses are related to new hires in the faculty complement.
- Question: Will other courses be archived? Answer: Overtime courses will be archived.
- Senators were advised that it has been a general practice that if a course is not offered over a period of three years, it is automatically archived and does not appear in the Academic Calendar.
- Question: Is it appropriate for courses to be removed from the Academic Calendar without Senate approval? Answer: The courses are not being deleted, only archived. As has been pointed out, if courses are not being taught, it is misleading to students to have them appear in the Academic Calendar.

Moved by Killam and seconded, **“that Senate approves the revised text as presented in the Semi-Annual Reports - appendices J2, J3, J4 and J5 for publication in the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar with the following stipulations:**

- 1) **J2 - Page 187 – Requirements for a Major in Bachelor of Arts Degree – remove: 1) “Nine (9) credit hours in GEOG at the 4000-level including.” and 2) “Note: In addition to the eighteen (18) credit hours.... A, B, C, D).”**
- 2) **J2 - Page 187 – Requirements for a Double Major in Geography and a science other than Geology in a Bachelor of Science Degree – in v. revise to read B or C.**
- 3) **J5 – Senate approval of the revisions to the MBA/CPA Program is predicated by the receipt of MPHEC approval of the Program Modification Proposal.”**

**Motion carried.**

**20047**            **REPORTS OF AD-HOC COMMITTEES**

None.

**20048**            **REPORTS OF JOINT COMMITTEES**

None.

**20049**            **NEW BUSINESS FROM**

a) Floor (not involving notice of motion)

- i. 2019 Report on Positive Action to Improve the Employment of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible minorities, and People with Disabilities at Saint Mary's University, ***Appendix K***.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- **Action Item: Bell** to correct agenda to reflect a date change on the Report from 2018 to 2019.
- Section 10.4.8 of the SMUFU Collective agreement states that the employer will report in writing annually to Senate and to the Board by December on actions taken to improve the employment of members of the four groups specified in 10.4.1 (women, aboriginal peoples, visible minorities, and people with disabilities) in the university community, and in particular the development and implementation of the hiring goals required for academic units.
- Saint Mary's University overall data is based on 983 Full-time and regular part-time employees, with 836 providing Employment Equity Information. Of those employees surveyed, there were 621 self-identifications.
- Saint Mary's University data on full-time faculty and professional librarians is based on 286 Full-time Faculty and 10 Professional Librarians. 242 Full-time Faculty and 9 Professional Librarians responded to the survey representing an overall response rate of 86%.
- 433 survey respondents self-identified as women; this represents 107.5 % of the labour market expectation of 403. Based on this Guideline, relative to survey respondents at Saint Mary's University, members of visible minorities and Aboriginals are underrepresented.
- Table 1.b, Survey Respondents represents the real data. This data was reviewed.
- Women at SMU represent 51.8% of survey respondents, thirty greater than the labour market expectation.
- Aboriginals represent 1.3 % of survey respondents representing a gap of twenty-two.
- Persons with disabilities represent 6.8 % of survey respondents, nineteen less than the labour market expectation.
- Members of a visible minority represent 14.4 % of survey respondents, representing a gap of fifty-eight.

- In table 4 a – 26 of 286 persons (8.9%) would be the labour market expectation for individuals identifying with a disability. At SMU there are 21 of 242 (8.9%). This is a momentous change from the 2018 report due to more people self-identifying in the survey.
- According to Federal Employment Equity Act Guidelines, underrepresentation is considered significant if the number gap is -3 or greater, and if the percentage gap is 80% or less of the labour market expectation. For the purpose of applying this Guideline, the percentage gap represents the number of employees self-identified in relation to the labour market expectation.
- 113 of the 242 Full-time Faculty members who responded to the survey, self-identified as a member of a specified group: women, Aboriginal, disability and visible minority. Note that respondents may have self-identified as a member of more than one group. Based on survey responses, 45.0% percent of Full-time Faculty identified as women, 0.4 % as Aboriginal, 7.4 % as a person with a disability, and 23.6 % as a visible minority. The number of Professional Librarians respondents (n=9) is too small to show a breakdown of numbers according to the four specified groups and therefore data are provided solely for representation of women.
- 109 Full-time Faculty Members self-identified as women representing 45.0% (Table 3b) of survey respondents. This compares to a labour market expectation of 44.0% (Table 4b). Based on survey respondents only, the Faculty of Science (n= 83) females comprise 34.0 % (Table 3b) of Full-time Faculty. This results in an identified gap of 9 (76.0%) (Table 5b) in the Faculty of Science. This is considered a significant gap under the Guidelines.
- It is important to remember that this information is being presented within the context of the requirements of the report. Overall, there are no significant gaps for the university.
- We ask the faculties to report to us in relation to actions being taken in this regard in the past year.
- There being no further discussion or objection, the 2019 Report on Positive Action to Improve the Employment of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible minorities, and People with Disabilities at Saint Mary's University was accepted into the Senate record.

- Question: Can you advise the Senate on the status of the policy on Equity? Answer: A focus was the deadline for responses to the Canada Research Chair Program. That response was taken as a priority. The deadline for that submission was the end of September. To do this we had to engage an expert consultant through the summer. We have 9 Canada Research Chairs. We established a committee with a diverse application background. This group has met once with some virtual interactions. We are going to be meeting in the New Year to inform the EDI Plan for the University.
  - Question: Is there a timeline for completion? Answer: Not at this time. Butler will report back in January on the status.
  - Question: Can we broaden our hiring criteria to include gender and sexual orientation? Answer: Not until we have an Equity Plan. If you introduce a preference in a hiring plan that is an immediately an issue in terms of the hiring process.
  - Sarty advised that the EDI Advisory Committee has expressed a strong preference for doing a thoughtful and researched response.
  - Question: For a number of years, the Senate has been speaking around the topic of retention in relation to this report. Can we have a report from Brothers-Scott on these issues? It would be important to understand what issues are related to retention. Answer: There are other initiatives that have been undertaken. **Action Item: Butler** will consult with Brothers-Scott and report back to Senate on this.
- ii. Anonymous statement by a faculty member:
- Statement: The main issue that is being raised is a silent problem affecting many people – mostly female faculty and students (both male and female). The problem can be seen in the dynamics of twenty somethings. The problem is exacerbated by social media, entitlement, and socialization issues. These issues combine and manifest in classrooms, hallways and emails that are starting to create retention issues with some faculty and students. A written document was circulated articulating several incidences of hostility, aggression, and abusive language experienced recently within the learning environment.
  - Several Senators backed up the speaker, indicating that they know of similar incidents on campus. As the discussion unfolded, there was a broad consensus that the increasing frequency and severity of such incidents is a significant cause for concern on this campus.
  - This type of behavior is causing a loss of institutional reputation and directly impacting retention of both faculty and students as well as recruitment (word of mouth references). A more comprehensive conversation about what is and is not appropriate behavior on campus is needed.

- Concern was expressed that the well-meaning activities taking place may not be enough or happening fast enough.
- Policies related to this type of behavior are not easily accessed. We need tools for faculty, staff, and students to use that are easily and quickly found and that can be used to respond to these situations.
- It was suggested that there are ways to make accessing these policies easier.
- This speaks to the quality of the learning environment. This impacts students that hear and experience this type of behavior. Saint Mary`s states that we work to ensure a safe and secure environment for all students, faculty, and staff. There was important work done during the Safe and Secure SMU initiative. That had momentum which has been lost to some degree. What is being asked is for us to reignite this momentum to respond to these issues. This is a multi-faceted issue. We need to focus on the quality of the learning environment so that everyone feels safe and comfortable participating. We need a coordinated, integrated, and cohesive strategy to address this situation.
- We also need to think about the students that are supported by the Smithers Centers. Faculty do not always know how to deal with these situations. We need more faculty workshops and training in this area.
- Navas advised that the students have reported on this type of issue on a regular basis. Students are afraid to come forward and report these incidences. There are no tools for them to use to report incidents. A policy and process to hold everyone accountable is needed.
- Open conversation can be difficult and at times ineffective. When individuals attempt to address a situation, they are passed around from one office individual to another.
- A key component is to create awareness and to set expectations about what the learning environment looks like. Senators were advised that whatever is done in this regard, SMUSA would like to be included and participate in those efforts.
- The Code of Conduct is being revised but we also need to raise awareness. There needs to be a more robust site for policies that provides more information than just the policy.
- We need to create an environment where people feel comfortable and safe bring issues forward.
- Question: Is there a formal discipline process? Answer: Yes. There is a policy that has been approved by the Senate. There have not been as many cases as there could be if all incidents were reported. Some incidents are resolved informally, and others are formally addressed. In recent years there have been 5-10 cases annually.

- A challenge intrinsic in this situation is that people are reticent to come forward to report. It is really important to encourage people to report. The challenge is that people want something done quickly.
- This is not just a Senate issue. Creating a Senate Committee might be a mistake. If we are to do something meaningful in a comprehensive way, we need a group that has an extremely broad representation.
- Other Universities have tackled this issue. There is good consultation and analysis related to how those institutions addressed this. It has to be addressed through a community perspective.
- Question: Should this be a President`s Committee?
- People are not only vulnerable, but they do not come forward because they think nothing will be done. We need to let everyone know that there is a process in place that works and that will keep them safe.
- There are critical things in current policies that do not encourage people to come forward that need to be addressed.
- It was suggested that the University inform students and faculty about the incidents that are occurring on campus.
- There is a tremendous amount of information embedded on the SMU website. The key point is how to get that information in front of people.
- We do not capture actions around faculty and staff except in the policy on Violence in the Workplace where it states that all members of the University community, including faculty, staff, students, and visitors, are responsible for creating and maintaining a safe and secure work environment.
- We need to think about a situation where the two participants involved in an incident are brought together during the resolution process.
- Having the initiative as a President`s initiative or Task Force is helpful and raises the profile.
- Do we not have a Communication Officers team that could push out this information?
- A Senator emphasized that we need a laser focus on the learning environment factor of this situation. The behaviour in the class or hallways is where we need to focus.
- It was suggested that the Student Code of Conduct should be posted and emphasized in the classroom.

**20050**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Barb Bell,  
Secretary of Senate