



One University. One World. Yours.

Halifax, Nova Scotia,  
Canada  
B3H 3C3  
Senate Office  
Tel: 902-420-5412

## SENATE MEETING MINUTES February 12, 2021

The 622nd Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held via Zoom on Friday, February 12, 2021, at 2:00 PM. Dr Takseva, Chairperson, presided.

**PRESENT:** Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr Butler, Dr Francis, Dr VanderPlaat, Dr Sarty, Dr Austin, Dr Bannerjee, Dr Brosseau, Dr Collins, Dr De Fuentes Dr Grandy, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Hanley, Dr O'Brien, Dr Panasian, Dr Power, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Mr Brophy, Ms Killam, Ms van den Hoogen, Mr de Chastelain, Mr Tumusiime Ms Winters, Mr Zokari, Dr Smith, Ms Sergeant-Greenwood, Dr Will Kay, Dr Morales (B.Comm) and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

**REGRETS:** Dr Bhabra, Dr Twohig, Dr Hart, and Ms Nankani.

Meeting commenced at 2:02 P.M. with the territorial acknowledgement.

**21067**      **REPORT OF AGENDA COMMITTEE**  
The Agenda Committee report was accepted.

**21068**      **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**  
Posted as *Appendix A* for this meeting (10 min).

**Key Discussion Points:**

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

- The virtual winter 2021 convocation is taking place on February 13.
- In the coming weeks, working with the Board of Governors on financial approval, we will announce a significant investment in information technologies, a multi-year project delivered in partnership with D2L, the company behind the Brightspace learning management system. As Dr. Butler noted last month, this investment will improve our virtual teaching and learning capacities, transform many internal processes and set us up well for the future.

**Intercultural Learning**

- Attended two virtual events, the Senior Internationalization Leaders Roundtable hosted by CBIE, and the International Holocaust Remembrance Day event.

- Two meetings of the BlackNorth Initiative (BNI) Education Committee were held recently to consider initiatives for black entrepreneurship.
- The advisory committee for the Scarborough National Charter has now finalised the charter document and will shortly begin distribution for consultation to partner universities. The Standing Committee on the Prevention of Racism will consider the document and will bring the Charter forward to Senate as soon as possible
- There was a session today titled ‘Decolonizing Education with Indigenous Traditional Knowledges’.

### **Institutional Sustainability**

- Aided by our Director of Government Relations, I continue to connect as much as possible with government officials and politicians, especially through the Universities Canada Virtual Advocacy meetings.
  - Conversated with Mr. Nadir Patel, High Commissioner of Canada to India, hosted by Universities Canada, where I led the High Commissioner in a conversation about the topic of student visa processing in India in the current context of the pandemic, and spoke of how our competitors are managing similar operations.
  - Also, spoke with His Excellency Dominic Barton, Ambassador of Canada to the People’s Republic of China (and honorary degree recipient of Saint Mary’s).
  - Attended a virtual event – Congress to Campus: US-Canada Relations hosted by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress (FMC) – and moderated by Dr. Edna Keeble of the Department of Political Science.
  - Attended a virtual Annual State of the Municipality where we heard from re-elected Mayor Mike Savage as he begins his third term, and he discussed his plans for how Halifax can work together to rebuild and grow.
  - Attended a virtual Farewell Address with Premier McNeil through the Halifax Chamber of Commerce, as well as a ‘virtual fireside chat’ with Premier McNeil, hosted by the Canada-China Business Council.
  - Attended a virtual meeting, “CEO Council on Affordable/ Attainable Housing” co-hosted by Wendy Luther, President & CEO of Halifax Partnership, and Mayor Mike Savage, addressing topics relevant to the future of our city.
- The Board of Governors Annual Retreat took place on February 5 and 6, with a focus on strategic planning and the role of the Board.

**21069**

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

Posted as *Appendix B* for this meeting (10 min).

#### **Key Discussion Points:**

- There is little change in registration. Normal trends seem to be continuing around student withdrawals.

- The annual MPHEC Digest was published (link: <http://www.mphec.ca/media/200206/Annual-Digest-2019-2020.pdf>), covering the previous decade up to 2019-2020. It does not cover the period impacted by COVID. The information in the report can be used to indicate where there is opportunity for program renewal and creation in areas where we have strength and that are of interest to students.
- The average grades in fall 2019 were 2.6 (just under a B-) and in fall, 2020 was 2.8 (just over a B-). Further, the DFW rate declined slightly. This is consistent with other institutions in our region. This information is being used to indicate where conversations may be required to improve course delivery, the curriculum, and student success.
- A template for resource needs was created and is available. Work is underway in this area to support program development.
- The Teaching Innovation Awards were finalized and will be posted soon. The deadline is October 1st each year, so this is lots of notice. There will be recurrent messaging around these awards.
- The core elements of the Strategic Research Plan were presented on Tuesday. The Interdisciplinary Initiatives Fund will help support initiatives.
- Conversations related to the creation of a Diversity Strategy for the University continue.
- The Accessibility Advisory Committee meets next week.

21070

### **SMUSA PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Posted as *Appendix C* for this meeting (5 min).

#### **Key Discussion Points:**

- The SMUSA elections are underway. That process will be completed by the beginning of March.
- When there is a campus closure due to weather, SMUSA suggests the closure of working from home and lectures to help mitigate the extra challenges created by these situations. By doing this, students and faculty will be better supported and able to succeed outside of these weather events.
- As registration dates approach for the 2021-2022 academic year, an announcement of SMU's delivery plan would be helpful.
- This week CAUL officially launched their Open Educational Resource (OER) repository along with granting funds to support faculty in creating OERs that allow for flexible learning. SMUSA hopes SMU will do everything possible to remove barriers for faculty interested in creating OERs. OER Grant information for interested faculty: <https://caul-cbua.ca/news/2021-02-09>
- Many international students wishing to return to Nova Scotia cannot afford the costly hotel quarantine. Many of these students delay their return in hopes that the quarantine requirements will change or that the associated cost will be reduced. Students are requesting clear

communication on the future intentions of International Student Quarantine.

- Many students are anxious about incurring technological problems that could affect their ability to write final exams. Allowing for exam writing taking place on campus would help relieve this problem.
- Many students are facing challenges when faculty stray from the stated delivery model. Students who have signed up for asynchronous classes have to reschedule their days to accommodate synchronous lectures or tests. With the add/drop date being long past, students must bear through, so they fall behind by dropping a class. Faculty check-ins would allow for clear expectations for faculty in what they can and cannot do with their course delivery.
- Many students wish to submit grade appeals for the fall 2020 term; some want to submit grade appeals for multiple classes. The \$30 fee for the submission of a grade appeal is creating a barrier for students. Building on the winter 2020 term, the \$30 fee should be permanently waived for grade appeals to help remove a barrier for students. This falls under Academic Regulations

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that Senate refers the Appeals fee question to the Academic Regulations Committee.” Motion carried.**

**21071**      **QUESTION PERIOD** (length at discretion of chair based on business volume)

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Question: There has been a halt to the search for a Dean of Arts. Why was this not announced? Answer: It was put on pause in the hopes that travel restrictions would be removed and then one candidate found another position and withdrew. We need to restart this search.
- Question: Are we looking for a Dean of Science? Answer: We will be activating this search soon.
- There is a delay due to personnel issues, and Grad school admissions are falling behind. Response: Due to a medical leave, there has been a personnel issue. There have been no requests for special attention to any application.

**21072**      **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Minutes of the meeting of January 22, 2021, were *circulated* as **Appendix E**.

There being no objections or revisions, **the minutes of the meeting of January 22, 2021 are approved as circulated.**

**21073**      **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

.01 Report covering LoPs that is bi-directional to facilitate an informed discussion in Senate. (Deferred from May 2020 – further deferred to Feb 2021 - Smith).

**Key Discussion Points:**

- COVID has superseded what is happening with LoPs. We did a report on what is happening across the province and what we can do to reduce the requests from SMU students.
- We do not have a central tracking system for LoPs. As soon as we assign the grade, the paper goes into the file and Banner does not have a way to identify that.
- There has been a significant drop off in LoPs since March 2020.
- We have a slightly improved way of tracking LoPs coming in now. The students requesting LoPs, are generally taking courses internationally. Those numbers have declined significantly because of COVID. There have been about 1/3 of the number in previous years.
- Science developed an anatomy course to address one of the issues that caused students to request LoPs.
- We are working towards a workflow process that will capture that information within the next year or two. This is being launched and will take more than a year to roll out. This will eventually roll out over all units, but that will take a few years. Priority will be given to areas where we need tracking of specific information to facilitate decision-making.
- Question: Will there be training? Answer: Training will be available soon.

21074

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

.01 Academic Discipline Appeals Board and Academic Discipline Committee, name change proposal, *Appendix E1*-Notice of Motion, *Appendix E2*-Revision form.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Takseva released the position of chair to the Vice-Chair Bannerjee.
- Remove the word “Discipline” from the name of the Academic ~~Discipline~~ Committee because it has negative implications and implies guilt and resulting punitive action. It may also deter students from engaging with this process. See revisions below:

5.2.2 Academic **Integrity** ~~Discipline~~ Committee

5.2.2.1 The Academic **Integrity** ~~Discipline~~ Committee shall:

1. Coordinate adjudication training for the Academic Integrity Officers, Academic Discipline Officer and members of the Academic **Integrity** ~~Discipline~~ Appeal Board once a year at minimum.
2. Monitor academic disciplinary process and outcomes
3. Review Academic Regulation #18 annually and submit any policy recommendations to Senate.

5.2.2.2 The composition of this committee shall be as follows:

1. The Chairperson of Senate or designate (who shall chair);
2. The Academic Integrity Officers;

3. The Academic Discipline Officer;
4. One representative from the Academic **Integrity Discipline** Appeal Board;
5. One representative from the Registrar's Office;
6. One student appointed by the Students' Association;
- and
7. Secretary of Senate (secretary).

and

- Remove the word "Discipline" from the name of the section 5.2.3 **Academic Discipline Appeal Board** because it has negative implications and implies guilt and resulting punitive action. It may also deter students from engaging with this process. Revise Committee name to Academic Integrity Appeal Board to mirror the revision to the AI Committee.

### 5.2.3 Academic **Integrity Discipline** Appeal Board

#### 5.2.3.1 The Academic **Integrity Discipline** Appeal Board shall:

1. Hear appeals from decisions of the Academic Integrity Officers (AIO), Academic Discipline Officer (ADO), and Senate Executive on the following grounds:
  - a) A failure to follow the "rules of natural justice";
  - b) A failure to follow University rules, regulations or policies;
  - c) Compelling new evidence not considered by the AIO, ADO, or Senate Executive which may have, in the opinion of the Chair of the Board, altered an earlier decision(s);
2. Have the responsibility to ensure the execution of its decisions.

#### 5.2.3.2 The composition of the Academic **Integrity Discipline** Appeal Board shall be as follows:

1. Six (6) representatives of the Faculty elected by Senate. For cases involving a graduate student, one of these will be appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies. No more than two (2) representatives from each of the Faculties of Arts, Business and Science shall be elected, with no two (2) Faculty representatives from the same Department;
2. Two (2) students appointed by the Students' Association. In cases involving a graduate student, one of these will be a graduate student.
3. The Chair of Senate will chair the Board.

Moved by Takseva and seconded, **"that Senate approves the revisions to of the Senate Bylaws 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 as submitted in Appendix E2 for this meeting."**  
**Motion carried.**

- .02 Student Discipline Committee, name change proposal, *Appendix F1*- Notice of Motion, *Appendix F2*-Revision form-SDC Terms of Reference.  
**Key Discussion Points:**
- Remove the word “Discipline” from name of this committee because of the negative implications. These revisions also align this Senate Bylaws section with the newly revised Code of Student Conduct document approved by Senate in February 2020 and will add a requirement for training for members.
- 5.2.16 Student **Discipline Conduct**
- 5.2.16.1 The Committee on Student **Discipline Conduct** shall recommend to Senate **the** policy on student **discipline conduct** and on the structures and procedures governing it.
- 5.2.16.2 **At least annually,** the Committee shall ~~at least annually~~ review the policies, structures and procedures of the existing **Code of Student Discipline System Conduct** and make recommendations to Senate.
- 5.2.16.3 Coordinate continuing education for the members of the Student Conduct Committee and the Adjudication Panel(s) as needed.**
- 5.2.16.4 The composition of the Committee on Student **Discipline Conduct** shall be as follows:
1. Three **faculty** members appointed by Senate, one of whom shall chair the committee, and, one of whom shall be the faculty member appointed by Senate to the ~~Discipline Appeal Board~~ **Adjudication Panel constituted for the purposes of an appeal;**
  2. **Senior Director of Student Affairs & Services or designate.**
  3. Two students appointed by **the** Students’ Association.

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the revisions to Senate Bylaws 5.2.16 as articulated in Appendix F2 for this meeting.” Motion carried.**

- .03 Academic Planning Committee
- i. B.Comm Degree Review (Dr Morales)  
*Appendix G* – APC Notice of Motion, *Appendix H* – Recommendation-Comparison summary, *Appendix I*- Self Study Report, *Appendix J* - Self Study appendices (J1-J20), *Appendix K* – Dean’s Response to Self Study, *Appendix L* - External Program Review Committee’s (PRC) Final Report, *Appendix M* - Program Response to ERC Report, *Appendix N*– Deans Response to ERC Report / Prog Response.  
**Key Discussion Points:**
- There have been some challenges over the years with reviews of the majors and that indicated a need to review the B. Comm Degree program. A positive review was completed.
  - There were points that the B. Comm program brought forward on which the reviewers did not comment, but the Committee is encouraged to pursue their plans in these areas.

### **Theme One: Content and Sequencing of the Core**

- **Recommendation 1.1:** APC applauds the Committee's "open-minded" approach to these recommendations. APC concurs with the Dean and Committee's responses to the external reviewers' recommendations. APC encourages the Committee to deal with recommendations that have resource implications to identify resource needs and the implications, so that optimal choices may be made going forward to produce a revised B.Comm Program. APC encourages the Committee to consider other Arts courses that address academic literacy requirements. APC understands that this will be more than a one-year exercise.
- **Recommendation 1.2:** APC concurs with the Dean's and the Committee's approach to evaluate COMM 2293 carefully by engaging all departments affected before making any significant changes.
- **Recommendation 1.3:** APC supports the Committee's approach to this recommendation.
- **Recommendation 1.4:** APC supports the Committee's approach to this recommendation.
- **Recommendation 1.5:** APC asks the Committee to consider this recommendation during their curriculum mapping exercise.
- **Recommendation 1.6:** APC encourages the Committee to consider this recommendation during their curriculum mapping exercise.

### **Theme Two: Consistency across Sections**

- **Recommendation 2.1:** APC concurs with the responses of the Dean and the Committee and encourages the Committee to develop a more robust mechanism for maintaining course consistency that is not overly dependent on individual faculty member(s).
- **Recommendation 2.2:** APC supports the Committee's approach to this recommendation and agrees with its import.
- **Recommendation 2.3:** APC supports the Committee's approach to this recommendation and agrees with its import.

### **Theme Three: Online Delivery**

- **Recommendation 3.1:** APC supports the Deans response. As they revise the program, APC encourages the Committee to explore how they can leverage the lessons learned from the university's response to the pandemic.
- **Recommendation 3.2:** APC supports the Deans response. As they revise the program, APC encourages the Committee to explore how they can leverage the lessons learned from the university's response to the pandemic.
- **Recommendation 3.3:** APC supports the Deans response. As they revise the program, APC encourages the Committee to



explore how they can leverage the lessons learned from the university's response to the pandemic.

#### **Theme Four: The Majors**

- **Recommendation 4.1:** APC supports the Dean's response.
- **Recommendation 4.2:** APC supports the Dean's response in the context of the recommendation to Recommendation 1.
- **Recommendation 4.3:** APC concurs with the Dean's response.

#### **Theme Five: Timing of Declaration of Majors**

- **Recommendation 5.1:** APC supports the Dean's responses and looks forward to the outcome of the consideration the timing of major declaration.
- **Recommendation 5.2:** APC concurs with the Dean's response.
- **Recommendation 5.3:** APC concurs with the Dean and Committee's responses.

#### **Theme Six: Co-op**

- **Recommendation 6.1:** APC concurs with this recommendation and encourages interaction with key offices that can work with the committee on the review.
- **Recommendation 6.2:** APC concurs with this recommendation and encourages interaction with key offices that can work with the committee on the review.

#### **Theme Seven: Other**

- **Recommendation 7.1:** APC supports the responses of the Dean and the Committee.
- **Recommendation 7.2:** APC concurs with the Committee's decision not to give credit for extracurricular activities.
- **Recommendation 7.3:** APC encourages the Committee's to continue and further utilize the library resources.
- Question: Is there a difference between the uses of the words, concur and support? Answer: When we concur – we are agreeing with the commentary and when we support we are agreeing with the actions that are being taken.
- Morales advised that with collaboration

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Bachelor of Commerce Degree Program submit an Action Plan that is based on the preceding recommendations, to the Academic Planning Committee (APC) in time for the April 2021 meeting of the APC”.**

And

- Question: If this is a policy, why does there have to be a motion?  
Answer: Because of the time that is provided in the motion.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that in February 2022, the Bachelor of Commerce Degree 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.

and

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that in February 2024, the Bachelor of Commerce Degree Program submit a three-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.

- ii. MPHEC Modification Proposal to change the name of the “Classics Program” to the “Ancient Studies Program, *Appendix O1*-APC Notice of Motion, *Appendix O2*-Name change proposal.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Question: Did the Department think about changing their Department name? Answer: The Department has not submitted a name change proposal at this time. We can ask the Acting Dean to inquire whether the department is considering a name change.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that Senate approves the MPHEC Modification Proposal for the Classics Program for submission to MPHEC.”** Motion carried.

- iii. Recommendation for termination - Canadian Centre for Ethics and Public Affairs (CCEPA), *Appendix P* – APC Notice of Motion

**Key Discussion Points:**

- In 2018, AST pulled out of collaboration with SMU on this Centre. No faculty champion has come forward at SMU to take over the leadership.
- APC would welcome the resurrection of this centre in the future but, given the current situation, we must make the reluctant decision to terminate CCEPA.
- If there were interest in reengaging in the activities of this centre, the Senate Policy would be the way to reestablish a new Centre.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate approves termination of the Canadian Centre for Ethics and Public Affairs (CCEPA) according to section 5 of the Senate Policy Governing the Establishment, Reporting and Review of Research Institutes and Centres of Saint Mary’s University #8-1009.”** Motion carried.

- .04 Academic Regulations Committee (Smith)
- i. Revision to Academic Regulation 18 - *Appendix Q1*-Notice of Motion, *Appendix Q2*-Revision form – Academic Regulation 18

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Revision to clarify the role of the student advocate and add a link to information provided in the Academic Integrity Handbook (see below).

**General Procedures**

Information on the Academic Integrity Procedure can be found in the Academic Integrity Handbook at:

<https://www.smu.ca/webfiles/AcademicIntegrityHandbook-OnlineVersionCR.pdf>

**Academic Integrity Officers and Academic Discipline Officer**

Each Dean will appoint an academic staff member to serve as the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) and carry out the responsibilities of this Policy within each Faculty.

When a member of the University community (faculty, staff, or student) believes that an academic offence has been committed, they file an Incident Report within 15 working days from the time the incident has been identified. The Report must identify and provide evidence of the alleged offence. The Incident Report will be forwarded to the AIO of the Faculty in which the incident occurred. If a student is subject to a penalty for an academic integrity issue that is applied outside of the processes detailed in this regulation, the student may file an academic appeal.

Reports must be on the form available from the Registrar's office at <https://smu.ca/academics/calendar/dishonesty-incident-report-form.html>. The AIO is responsible for processing the complaint as follows:

Upon receiving an Academic Integrity Incident report the AIO will:

- notify the Registrar who will advise the AIO as to whether this is the first incident of academic dishonesty for the student or students involved;
- collect additional evidence if necessary;
- communicate with the student, preferably in person. Students should be encouraged to bring representation in the form of a friend, peer or student advocate. These individuals are for support purposes only and have no active role during the meeting. The student should be advised that failure to meet with the AIO will result in the case being referred to the Academic Discipline

Officer (ADO). The student will also be advised that they cannot withdraw from the course in which there is an Academic Integrity charge against them.

- Question: Placement about the new sentence – penalty being applied – should go in its own location or at the end? Consensus was to place that sentence at the end of the paragraph.
- Question: Is this an Academic Appeal or is it an appeal under this process? Answer: We wanted to indicate that the appeal could go either way.

Moved by Smith and seconded, **“that Senate approve the revision to Academic Regulation 18 as revised above.” Motion carried.**

ii. Revisions to Academic Regulations 4,5,7,8,9,10,11 – *Appendix R1*- Notice of Motion, *Appendix R2* – Revision form – Academic regulations

**Key Discussion Points:**

- “two-week notice” is interpreted to mean two calendar weeks. Revise to make this specific in AR 4.  
4 Grading System  
c. Instructors must also inform students in writing on the first day of class of any “in-class” test which will be scheduled outside of the regular instructional hours of the course. Students who cannot write the test outside of class time must be offered reasonable accommodation. Students must give the instructor a minimum of a two **calendar-weeks** notice.
- The change to AR 5 was withdrawn because of an objection to the use of “calendar” month(s).
- “two weeks” is interpreted to mean two **calendar** weeks and “one month” is interpreted to mean one **calendar** month in AR 7.

**7. Standing Required**

**g. Suspension**

Once each academic year, students on probation will be suspended for one academic term if:

- (i) they are on probation and do not satisfy the requirements for continuance;
- (ii) they are on probation and fail to comply with any formal conditions governing their probation.

While on suspension, students may not enroll in any credit courses at the University and will not receive credit for any courses taken at other universities or colleges. After completing their suspension, students may resume their studies on probation (see d. above).

Students may appeal the suspension decision if their academic performance was affected by special circumstances.

- (i) Appeals will be considered in the case of health issues, bereavement and/or other acceptable cause, duly authenticated.

This is done by filling out the Suspension Appeal form available from the Service Centre, as well as providing evidence of the special circumstance(s).

(ii) Appeals must be received within two **calendar** weeks of notification by a suspension letter.

The appeal would then be evaluated by the Suspension Appeal Committee within the appropriate Faculty. If possible, within one month of receiving any appeal, the Committee shall render and communicate its decision through the Registrar to all parties concerned. The decision of the Suspension Appeal Committee is final.

- To be specific and to address virtual examination methods.

### **8. Tests, Examinations and Evaluations**

c. All final tests and examinations held during the above periods are scheduled by the Registrar. The maximum time allowed for each examination is three **consecutive** hours.

#### **d.**

(i) In a six (6) credit hour course, no single test given in a regularly scheduled class period (50 minutes or 75 minutes) shall contribute more than 20% of the overall evaluation for that course.

(ii) In a three (3) credit hour course, no single test given in a regularly scheduled class period (50 minutes or 75 minutes) or laboratory/recitation session (up to 3 hours) shall contribute more than 35% of the overall evaluation for that course.

- “one week” is interpreted to mean one **calendar** week and “one day” is interpreted to mean one **working** day in AR 9.

### **9. Final Grade**

a. At the end of each semester, instructors must submit to the Registrar, through Self-Service Banner, the grades of all students registered in their courses. For six credit hour courses taught over two terms, interim grades will be submitted at the end of the first term and final grades at the end of the academic year. The time frames for the submission of mid-year and final grades to the Registrar are:

(i) in the case of courses in which no formal examination was scheduled by the Registrar within the period designated by Senate for formal examinations, one **calendar** week from the beginning of the examination period;

(ii) in the case of courses in which formal examinations were scheduled by the Registrar within the period designated by Senate for such examinations, one **calendar** week from the day on which the examination was written;

Students have the right to expect their grades to be submitted by these deadlines in conformity with the faculty members’ terms of appointment.

At the start of each term, any blank grades from the previous term will be assigned a grade of F.

**b.** Final grades are available on Self-Service one **working** day after submission by the instructor. Grade reports are not produced.

**c.** Final grades are withheld from students who have money owing to the University or who have either money or books owing the University Library system.

**d.** Grades given at the end of a semester shall not be made known to students except by the Registrar. Under the FOI-POP legislation, it is not legal for members of faculty to publicly post grades without the written permission of the student.

**e.** Grade changes must be approved by the Dean of the Faculty in which the course is offered **before** they can be accepted for processing by the Registrar. Reason(s) for the change(s) is required at the time of submission.

- To be specific should this read “48 consecutive hours”? “one week” is interpreted to mean one **calendar** week in AR 10.

#### **10. Deferred Final Examinations**

**a.** A student may request a deferred final examination based on:

(i) serious illness, personal/family emergency, or unforeseeable adverse situation;

(ii) religious grounds, as per 8.g.;

(iii) participation in regional, provincial, national, or international activity.

Elective arrangements (such as travel plans) are not considered acceptable grounds for granting a deferred final examination.

**b.** A student who wishes to have such a request considered must submit the request in writing according to the timelines given in c. and d. (below). A student may submit a single request that applies to multiple examinations. Requests should be submitted through the Academic Advising Office of the Faculty in which the student is registered. Decisions on deferred examination requests are made by the Dean of the Faculty in which the course is offered.

**c.** Requests under a. (ii) and a. (iii) must be made in writing to the Dean and include appropriate documentation to support the request. When possible, such requests must be made within seven calendar days of the announcement of the examination date.

**d.** For consideration of requests under a.(i), a student must:

(i) Within 48 hours after the end of the final examination, report, or have a representative report (in writing if possible), to their Academic Advising Office, intention to request a deferred examination and

(ii) Within seven calendar days after the end of the examination submit to the Dean (or designate) a written request for a deferred examination. This request must be accompanied by an explanation of the circumstances which made it impossible for the student to write the regular examination and documentation that supports the request.

e. A decision will be communicated to the student and the instructor(s) within one **calendar** week of receipt of the request.

f. On approval of a deferred examination, the responsibility for setting and conducting the deferred examination will lie with the instructor and the department. Deferred examinations should be completed as soon as possible and normally (i.e. wherever possible) as follows: for fall term by January 31, for the winter term by May 31, for summer session one by July 31 and for summer session two by September 30.

- In AR 11 - Revision to identify the option of an interview for both instructors and students. In addition, to provide students with the option of having an advocate with them during the interview for emotional support and identify that the advocate has no active role during the meeting. “one month” and “three months” are interpreted to mean months. “six weeks” it interpreted to mean six calendar weeks.

## **11. Academic Appeals**

Students who have good reason to believe they have been subject to mistaken, improper or unjust treatment with respect to their academic work have the right to appeal to the Committee on Academic Appeals. An appeal must be based on solid evidence and not merely on injured feelings. This Committee’s jurisdiction extends only to individuals currently enrolled at the University or enrolled during the previous academic year and dismissed, (i.e., the Committee’s jurisdiction does not apply to individuals whose application for admission to a program at the University has not been accepted). Appeals shall be governed by the following procedures:

### **a. Appealing of Final Grades**

The only grades that may be appealed are official final grades. Students should be aware that when a grade appeal is launched, the grade can be raised, lowered, or remain unchanged.

(i) Students who wish to appeal a grade must first consult the instructor concerned within one month of receiving the grade and, if unsatisfied, should then consult the Associate Dean of the Faculty in which the course is offered. If informal resolution is not possible and the student wishes to pursue formal appeal, the student shall forward the appeal form and supporting documentation to the Committee on Academic Appeals through the Registrar. Academic Appeals must be submitted to the Registrar, within three months from the last day of the semester in which the course is taken. In their appeal documentation, the student must provide specifics as to when the instructor, and the Associate Dean were consulted, together with any other information the student considers relevant. A form to launch an appeal is available from the Service Centre. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that

the appeal form is submitted within the deadlines stated in this regulation. Appeals that fall outside of the stated deadlines will not be accepted and/or considered.

(ii) It is the responsibility of students to provide the Committee with the completed appeal form, copies of any communication with the instructor related to the appeal, any returned, graded work directly related to the grade you are appealing, and any returned, graded work on which your overall course grades were based.

(iii) It is the responsibility of instructors to provide the Committee with all relevant available material on which the grade was based. A student's course documentation should include grade history and copies of any retained graded materials on which the student's grades were based (i.e. exercises, reports, papers, tests, examinations). This documentation shall be retained on-campus for a minimum of twelve months from the deadline of submission of grades.

(iv) When all relevant appeal documentation is received, as soon as possible the Committee will meet to review the evidence presented and reconsider the grade. If necessary, the Committee may appoint a qualified examiner to review the grade. The examiners will submit their report and the evidence reviewed to the Committee for a final decision.

(v) Instructors and students are provided with the option of a five minute interview with the committee to personally present their case. Students may bring a friend, peer or student advocate to this interview. These individuals are for support purposes only and have no active role during the meeting. For a description of the Role of Student Advocates, see the following link: <https://www.smu.ca/webfiles/AcademicIntegrityHandbook-OnlineVersionCR.pdf>.

(vi) On the appeal for a change of grade, the decision of the Committee shall be final.

## **b. Other Appeals**

On appeals other than those for a change of grade (Example: Submissions for LOP and transfer credit), the procedures shall be as follows:

(i) Normally within one month of the event or the decision being received by the student, the student shall first consult the office concerned and, if unsatisfied, should then consult the Associate Dean of the appropriate Faculty. If informal resolution is not possible and the student wishes to pursue formal appeal, the student shall submit the appeal form and supporting documentation to the Committee on Academic Appeals through the Registrar.



(ii) The Chairperson of the Committee on Academic Appeals shall forward a copy of the appeal to the Dean of the appropriate Faculty, and, if relevant, to the Chairperson of the Department and

(iii) On 5 May 1993, the Academic Senate of the University passed an Enabling Motion which reads in part "...that the Executive Committee of Senate [be] empowered to deal with all appeals concerning graduation which may be made prior to Convocation." Procedurally, these appeals are made to the Registrar.

the instructor.

### **c. Decision**

If possible, within one month of receiving any appeal under (a) or (b) above, the Committee shall render and communicate its decision through the Senate Office to all parties concerned. Pending possible further appeal, the Committee will retain the evidence presented to it for a period of six **calendar** weeks after rendering its decision.

### **d. Appeal of Committee's Decision**

Except in the case of an appeal for a change of grade, students shall have the right to appeal an adverse decision to the Executive Committee of Senate. Such an appeal shall be governed by the following procedures.

(i) Within one month of receiving the decision of the Committee, students shall submit their appeal in writing to the Secretary of Senate who shall forward the appeal together with all previously considered evidence to the Executive Committee of Senate for its consideration.

(ii) Within one month of receiving the appeal, the Executive Committee shall render and communicate its decision through the Secretary of Senate to the Registrar, who in turn shall communicate the decision to the student and to the Committee on Academic Appeals and take any further required action.

(iii) The decision of the Executive Committee shall be final.

### **e. Fee**

All appeals to the Committee on Academic Appeals must be accompanied by a payment of a \$30.00 fee. Further appeal under (d) above requires an additional payment of \$30.00. In the event of a decision favourable to the appellant, all payments will be refunded.

**Notes:**

(a) The Committee shall consult with the appellants and instructors.

(b) The appellants and instructors will be invited to appear before the Committee(s) hearing the appeal.

(c) Members of a committee cannot participate in the hearing of an appeal arising from an action to which they were a party.

- Question: What is the difference between a calendar week and a working week? Answer: Some people interpreted a week as Mon-Fri and others from Sunday to Saturday. Sunday - Saturday versus Monday – Friday. There have been questions and therefore we wanted to make it explicit.
- An objection was expressed to the term ‘calendar month. It does not add to the clarity. The mover accepted this as a friendly amendment. The revision to AR 5 is withdrawn.

Moved by Smith and seconded, **“that the Senate approves revisions to Undergraduate Academic Regulations 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, as articulated in Appendix R2 or this meeting.” Motion carried.**

**21075**

**NEW BUSINESS FROM**

a) Floor (not involving notice of motion)

i. Pandemic rules - concern about enforcement of mask wearing.  
(Agenda Committee)

**Key Discussion Points:**

- This was related to concerns about classroom teaching.
- Butler spoke to the on-campus committee in this regard and advised that we are only using classrooms where social distancing can be enforced.
- We are being very careful to ensure that any rules we have in place are consistent with or exceed the provincial guidelines.
- Faculty with experience with on-campus, in-person classes and (34 out of 35 faculty asked) would like masks to be used on campus. Members were advised that, for the most part, people are wearing masks in classes.
- All other campuses in Nova Scotia have a mandatory mask-wearing rule. The published policy for Dal is the same as ours but it will not be in the future.
- As we move to a greater density on campus we may require masks, but we have not done that because it has not become an issue yet.
- Question: Can faculty request that students wear masks?  
Answer: Yes. If you are in a classroom and there is appropriate

social distancing, that changes the dynamic and mask wearing is not required under the current guidelines.

- Concern was expressed that enforcement can be subjective from class to class.
- Students and faculty have confidence issues that need addressing. This is related to the concern around the second wave and new strains of COVID that are being identified.
- Concern has been expressed about a culture of complacency that may be developing. Response: This is a concern with all institutions in the region.
- Attendance to the in-person, on-campus classes is about 50%. Only about half of the students that register for these classes are taking advantage of these experiences.
- Question: Were the registrations in place before the classes were designated as in-person? Answer: That may be one of the reasons for the 50% attendance data. If we could retain the hybrid model delivery, it might increase our registrations.
- Question: Moving forward to the fall, continuing a dual-model of teaching (in-person and online, student's choice) is not sustainable, especially for large classes. For fall 2020, it was an emergency. Moving forward, we would need separate instructors for the in-person and online experiences with the lab. The students that take each type would need to be tracked.
- A Senator heard from a contact at Dalhousie that they have not had any face-to-face classes this academic year. However, it is mandatory for folks to wear masks in all Dal buildings. In preparing for face-to-face courses this summer, we are requiring students to wear masks while in the classroom. This is even with social distancing between students. Approval will not be given to run these courses without this understanding. In preparing the proposals for these courses they are being asked to consider guidelines that assume one of the students in the class is COVID positive, and how would they minimize the risk of transmission”
- There are also still technological challenges for hybrid classes that are not delivered in lecture format.

ii. Discussion – plans for spring/summer/fall terms (Butler).

**Key Discussion Points:**

- For spring and summer, we have planned for virtual delivery. If there were faculty that want to do something with a blended model, we would consider that. Nothing would be mandated for the spring and summer terms.
- There are core principles that must be in place.
- Regarding the fall 2021 course delivery – The vaccinations will not be complete. There will not be a ‘normal’ to return to, and there will still be significant challenges to address.

- We must think about creating a functional reality on campus. We need to create some on-campus activities for first- and second-year students.
- On-line options will still be available for students unable to access campus-based activities.
- Graduate programs should be able to run fully on campus.
- There are resource issues attached to the virtual delivery of large classes, and/or larger blended/mixed model class delivery.
- Resource concerns also exist around supporting experiential components of courses, particularly when blended.
- We will begin to work with the Deans to identify which courses face these needs and how to address them effectively.
- There are also still technological challenges for hybrid classes that are not delivered in lecture format.
- There is evidence of some faculty burnout. Students have shared they feel challenged with this model and are aware of the increased and unsustainable workload on faculty.
- Question: What types of resource and course supports could we be looking at? Answer: Other universities have engaged Graduate TAs (could we create an equivalency for this.)
- Many existing online resources allow things like lab exercises. These resources were originally free but have ended up being marketed by the Universities that previously offered them free.
- Question: Regarding the scheduling for on campus activities, if there are situations where we have postponed activities because of the need to use equipment, can we move to weekends to access these resources? Answer: Yes. There is room in the timetable to do things like that. If people are willing, there are ways to do this.
- Some labs need more than the 3-hour timeframe because the work with samples must stay on campus and time is needed to complete this type of work. Response: Flexibility and adaptability is something that we will have to model as well.
- There is a technological piece that needs to be added. With some students not being in the country, having a meaningful discussion with students in the classroom has been challenging.
- Question: Will we have discussions before the current schedule two goes on Banner about in-person classes? Answer: The conversations will begin next week. If we can arrive at some decisions, we will get those out quickly. There will be thoughtful ideas on how this could be done. We must look at the University's long-term survival.
- Will registration be delayed until the big decisions are made about delivery? Answer: No.
- Question: One repetitive concern is about integrity of tests and exams. Can we think about going to mandatory on-campus tests/exams (or equivalents, like approved proctors for folks

who are abroad)? Answer: This is a continuing concern. We are considering ways to address some of these concerns.

- Question: What do we do about classes that cannot be on camera? For example, classes with crime photos and victims of sexual assaults? These things cannot be live streamed or posted online. Answer: There is a multitude of considerations with these types of courses. We may end up considering the role of these courses within the programs.
- If we must tweak some of the spring and summer courses to provide for some in-person classes, we can do this.
- We need to hear back from the Deans about what their registrations are in the fall and then discuss the situation.
- This discussion reflects faculty commitment to student learning and engagement...a wish to figure out how to satisfy our diverse student population while considering various types of courses in an uncertain COVID landscape. We must find a way to make this initiative sustainable for the faculty and the others involved.
- Question: Are we to expect further town halls related to this discussion? Answer: We will have faculty-focused discussions in this regard. Deans are encouraged to organize these types of events. If there were cause, Butler would be happy to organize a focused Town Hall Event.

iii. Temporarily create a 1000-level special topics course in Arts to facilitate the piloting of a first-year seminar program (Smith/Twohig).

- Senate is asked to consider approving a temporary special topics course in Arts.
- This proposal comes out of SEM planning process. We have had two pilot courses running for the past three years and we are trying to decide how to roll this out. They are required courses in Science and Business, but it has taken a while to come up with something for the Faculty of Arts. These are interdisciplinary courses organized around a theme. Students will experience one larger theme via a diverse group of faculty, all of whom have unique pedagogical approaches and expertise.
- We have brought this discussion item to Senate because we need to create a course that students can register in for the fall 2021. If successful, we could make it a permanent component of the Arts program. It could be quite helpful in improving student success in the Faculty of Arts. This should also help retain students at the 3<sup>rd</sup> - and 4<sup>th</sup>-year levels and help facilitate discussions on interdisciplinary programs in general. Students have shown interest in interdisciplinary courses.
- Similar programs at other universities have been successful. It is a very interesting model and provides students with some very interesting opportunities.

- Question: Are the faculty specific seminars available to students outside of the specific faculty? Answer: Technically yes. First year Chemistry does this, Management 1281 does this in the Sobey School of Business. Student enrolled in these courses might find there would be some overlap. The target during this pilot would be the first year Arts student.
- We are not creating these courses as a requirement. Ideally, we want to create a course that everyone takes. It would be functionally, but not explicitly, required. That may be a future development. The Faculty of Arts would have to discuss whether this would become a requirement.
- Question: For next Senate meeting, will a proposal be submitted? Answer: We are only trying to create a course code so that the course can be offered. Yes. A proposal will be presented at the March Senate meeting. **Action Item: Bell** to place this on the March Agenda.
- Like interdisciplinary programs, we must ensure buy-in from the departments involved. The Acting Dean and her team will have to ensure that the resources are available to support this activity. To be successful, departments will have to feel comfortable that they will not be losing resources.
- Question: Will this open avenues to consider team teaching? Answer: This is an opportune time to discuss what team teaching means.

21076

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:21 P.M.

Barb Bell,  
Secretary of Senate