



One University. One World. Yours.

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

SENATE MEETING MINUTES April 10, 2015

The 565th Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, April 10, 2015, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr D. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

PRESENT: Dr Dodds, Dr Dixon, Dr Bradshaw, Dr MacDonald, Dr Smith, Dr Vessey, Dr Naulls, Dr Power, Dr Austin, Dr Bjornson, Dr Francis, Dr Gilin Oore, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Kozloski, Dr Secord, Dr Short, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr Warner, Ms DeYoung, Mr Michael, Mr Hotchkiss, Mr. Hamilton, Mr Dhudak, Mr Feehan, Mr Patriquin, Mr Rice, Dr Crocker, Dr van Proosdij, Dr O'Malley and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr Gauthier, Dr Campbell and Dr VanderPlaat

Meeting commenced at 2:35 P.M.

14066 **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**
The report of the Agenda Committee was accepted.

14067 **HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE**
Documents circulated at meeting as Appendix A.
Key Discussion Points:

- A call for nominations was sent out to faculty and we have received some responses which are being reviewed. The names submitted today predate those that have been submitted by faculty.
- The committee is very sensitive to demographics, gender and industry balance. Two very high profile female candidates that were previously approved by Senate, could not make it for the Spring convocation. Two more female candidates are being presented today for the consideration of Senate.
- Question: Discipline and area are also important. Are the four candidates for May balanced in that sense? Answer: Yes.
- Question: If we ended up without a female candidate for the Spring ceremonies, would the Senate be comfortable substituting a male candidate? Answer: Consensus was yes.
- Question: Is there a possibility that an honorary degree recipient may feel insulted if they do not get asked to speak? Answer: That is a possibility.

- Question: What are our criteria for having speakers at Convocation? Have we considered multiple speakers? Answer: No. We traditionally have conducted the ceremony the same way with only one speaker.
- The terms of reference for this committee have been made available. It was requested that the committee better articulate a set of criteria under which a candidate will be considered. It was noted that a key attribute would be someone that embodies the values of Saint Mary's.

Moved by Dodds and seconded, **“that Senate approves the nominations for Honorary Degrees as submitted by the Honorary Degrees Committee and will forward these nominations to the Board of Governors for consideration.” Motion carried.**

14068

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting of March 13, 2015, were *circulated* as *Appendix B*.

Moved by Dhudak, and seconded, **“that the minutes of the meeting of March 13, 2015 are approved as circulated.” Motion carried.**

14069

BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

Continued Senate discussion regarding Academic Integrity (AR#19) i.e.: hiring another individual to take a course or write exam on their behalf and falsifying University IDs. ID Presentation by M. DeYoung – Photo IDs and identifying fakes (~10-15 min). AR #19 attached as *Appendix S* (for reference), Notice of Motion attached as *Appendix T*

Key Discussion Points:

- The student has since been dismissed.
- The University Librarian advised Senators that students get ID cards as soon as they have an A number. If faculty submit a class list with ‘A’ numbers to the library, they could be provided with the photos of the students in their class. This is information that is considered private and cannot be shared.
- Members were advised that students can submit a photo ID electronically and with some verification, they are provided an ID. The Library confirms the identity of the student when the ID is picked up. The Library is reviewing the criteria for issuing IDs.
- On a regular basis, the Library would like the registrar to provide a list of students that have withdrawn.
- Question: What do students have to provide as identification for an ID? Answer: We pull up the photo ID and do a visual match. Occasionally we need to ask for a passport to verify.
- The Dean, SSB advised that students have advised the Sobey School that it is very easy to fool the system that is in place at Saint Mary's. A review of the processes will need to be undertaken.
- It was noted that the system the library uses is not connected to Banner. There are no discussions underway to link the university system and the library system.
- ITSS is looking into a one card system. In terms of maintaining student ID information, the system only goes back five years and then the system over writes.
- Each bus pass is worth \$150 and that is a problem for SMUSA when there is fraud.

- Question: Are there any issues with professors taking pictures? Answer: No. This also is viewed as a positive by the students. They perceive the professor as making an effort to remember them and to learn their names.
- It was noted that there is a significant demand on the faculty members to learn names and faces (especially with larger classes). This still would not address the issue of someone representing someone else for a whole class.
- Question: Can Banner handle pictures? Answer: It would require a modification to Banner. One reason for not making custom changes to Banner is that when there are updates to Banner (which is frequently), the modifications require extra testing steps. The University decided not to make custom revisions due to the additional costs involved in the testing process.
- Question: Do you ever call the police? If there is a case where there is fraud we need to take serious steps to deal with that. Answer: We haven't dealt with a similar case before so have not advised the police in the past.
- Members were advised that the Sobey School applications are down 110 for the fall. If the University does not respond appropriately to this situation, it is going to undermine this institution.
- It was noted that we need to know our students and if that takes additional funds and resources to deal with this issue, we need to invest whatever is needed.
- Impersonation of another student is fraud and a legal issue. Saint Mary's absolutely need a policy on this.
- It was noted that the current regulation requires students to show their IDs but faculty are not required to check them.
- Deans require more information on recognizing fake IDs before they can disseminate that information to faculty. If they had that information they would send it out immediately.
- The Registrar reminded members that Senate rejected the stronger language in the Exam policy when it stated that "Faculty will check". This language was softened at the request of Senate.
- The Registrar noted that cheating behavior is pervasive and everywhere. The issues experienced recently at SMU are not new. Young people have been using fake IDs for one purpose or another for generations.
- Members were advised that buying a term paper from another individual is in violation of our academic regulations but it is not a criminal action. The university must proceed with caution in terms of what is a criminal act and what is not. It was suggested that individual Deans and faculty members should not be calling the police in these situations.
- It was suggested that Student IDs should have student signatures on them and currently they do not.
- It was noted that the only difference in the ID card involved in the current situation was that the ID was thicker. Otherwise, it was a perfect SMU ID.
- A senator advised that even the guidelines that are available on-line are useable in terms of recognizing a fake ID.
- Members were advised that there are different color validation stickers that are used for different years.
- A suggestion was to scan the barcode on the ID and that would then bring up the picture of the individual.
- It was suggested that perhaps directing Deans to inform faculty may not be the right approach. This should be put this into policy.

- It was noted that Saint Mary's needs to have the right procedures in place to deal with these situations.
- *Referred to the Regulations Committee* for further consideration in terms of a policy.

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the Faculty Deans make an immediate request to all faculty members teaching in their Faculties that faculty members verify students’ identities during final exams, be vigilant for forged University Identification Cards, and confiscate any IDs they suspect are forged for forwarding to their appropriate Dean. Deans should provide faculty members teaching in their faculties with guidance on how to distinguish authentic SMU student identification cards from fake ones.”**
Motion carried.

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the Academic Regulations committee examine the effectiveness of Regulation 8f: “Students are required to present their valid Saint Mary’s University student identification cards at all tests and examinations for possible verification of their photographs or signatures”.** **Motion carried.**

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the Registrar work with ITSS and whomever else is needed to review Banner to address the issue of photo IDs with the aim of promoting academic integrity and report back to Senate.”**
Motion carried

- .02 Senate discussion requested on our approach to academic discipline. (deferred from March 13)
- i) Should there be a summary report to Senate, or made more widely available, of cases, outcomes, and lessons learned?
 - ii) Is greater clarity around process needed?
 - iii) Would restorative justice be a better lens for restructuring our regulation? Could restorative justice principles be fruitfully incorporated?

Key Discussion Points:

- The registrar submitted a summary report designated as *Appendix U* for this meeting. The report consisted of the reported incidents of academic dishonesty from 2010 to 2014. A discipline breakdown was provided for 2012-2014.
- Question: What has been the trend over time? Answer: It has been pretty flat.
- Question: Which of these cases are resolved and which are outstanding? Answer: There are a small number that go before a hearing panel. We had four submitted to a hearing panel for this term and three have been resolved. The fourth one is stalled. Next week it will be reassigned.
- A case may stall for a number of issues. Students may not be motivated to respond. Our regulations could give more direction in terms of how long the hearing panel must wait if the faculty member or student is not responding before they can proceed without their participation.

- The regulations only require that the instructor notify the Registrar of the incident and then the Registrar's office notifies the student. The Registrar's Office does not need lots of information on the initial situation but the instructor must retain the documentation so that it is available if the student appeals the process.
- It was suggested that we consider incorporating restorative justice ideas in the judicial process.
- Nova Scotia is one of the areas of the world that uses restorative justice. This is a process and not a penalty. We should consider how we can have our policies and processes follow the principles of restorative justice. As an educational institution this is a better approach and teaches the students a more poignant lesson.
- There are lots of resources available. Crocker would be delighted to participate in any developments in this area. **Action item: Referred to the Regulations Committee** for further consideration.
- Does restorative justice take more time and work on behalf of the professor? Answer: It won't work if people don't want to do it. It could take longer but it could also be very quick.
- Question: What is the role of Senate in this regard? Answer: Senate is responsible for the educational policy of the University which includes academic integrity. Senate is also responsible for regulations and student discipline.

14070

.01

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic Planning Committee

- i) Geography program review documentation circulated as: **Appendix C** – APC Notice of Motion, **Appendix D** – Recommendation-Comparison summary, **Appendix E**- Self Study Report, **Appendix F** - Self Study appendices (1-12), **Appendix G** – Dean's Response to Self Study, **Appendix H**- External Review Committee's (ERC) Final Report, **Appendix I**- Department Response to ERC Report, **Appendix J** - Dean's Response to ERC report. (Dr van Proosdij attending)

Key discussion points:

- The members of the Academic Planning Committee considered all 8 recommendations to be valuable and worth consideration. Those recommendations that are not being forwarded to Senate are referred to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and the Geography program for consideration.
- **Recommendation 3 - Original Recommendation:** "Working within the parameters of the Collective Agreement, address workload issues to ensure faculty retention and reduce potential for burnout." **Modified:** "The issue must be dealt with by the Department with an analysis of how they structure their classes and labs. The department needs an action plan on how they are going to review what the best way is to address the learning outcomes for their students."
- **Recommendation 4** - We recommend that all science-based courses within the Department and those who instruct these courses be considered "science" courses for both the workload allocations and degree program requirements within the University. APC agrees with

the Dean's response and encourages further discussion and analysis of this issue.

- **Recommendation 7** - The Deans, the Director and the Departments develop a more refined relationship and coordination between the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies and the overall School of the Environment. APC agrees with the Dean's and Program's responses and encourages continuing dialogue and effort in this area.
- **Recommendation 8** - The new Department of Geography and Environmental Studies proceed to review their overall curriculum in all three program streams, once the new hire in Urban Geography arrives next year. APC agrees with the Dean's and Program's responses and encourages further investigation of new experiential learning opportunities giving consideration to the current budgetary constraints.
- Question: Half of the recommendations are outside the purview of Senate. This is becoming more prevalent in the review documentation that is being brought forward to Senate. Is there a better way to address those recommendation that are outside of the purview of the Senate? Answer: The MPHEC framework requires us to look at those issues. Ultimately, financial and resource issues go through the SMU budgetary process. The Deans sit on the Budgetary Advisory Committee and therefore those recommendations that are outside of the purview of Senate are valuable input and are considered during the budgetary process. The Committee's recommendations go to the Board.
- It was noted that all of the recommendations were thoroughly discussed at APC.
- Senators expressed the opinion that Senate should still address every single recommendation. It was suggested that if Senate were to approve more resources for the program and a year later it was not possible to allocate those resources, it would be incumbent on Senate to terminate the program because it is not sustainable. It was noted that Senate can terminate any academic program at Saint Mary's.
- To continue to operate a program without addressing the resource issues negatively impacts the academic integrity of the program. Members were advised that the Deans and the programs collaborate and discuss how to get the resources that are needed.
- Senate has not terminated many programs. We did have a program review in Modern Languages that recommended terminating the German major due to the lack of resources. Senate terminated that program. When the reviewers state that the program cannot be maintained without more resources, we seriously review that recommendation and take appropriate action. That is not the case here.
- The APC notice of motion recognizes all the recommendations as beneficial and refers those that are not being recommended to Senate to the Deans and program for further action. That is the way to recognize that there are resources issues and that those should be addressed.

- Question: What does it mean to recognize a Geography courses as a Science? Answer: There are some courses, because of the content, that count as science credits in one application and do not in another application. The reviewers through it was time for a discussion on this issue. The recommendation seems to do with faculty workload. There is also an issue that a student taking a double major cannot take one of our courses as a science credit. It has to be taken as a free elective.
- Members were advised that because of available seating in a lab, more than one section is required, which doubles the time faculty are instructing. This is an issue of FCE allocation and a collective agreement issue.
- This is also a historical issue in regard to what is considered a science course and what is not. There is a precedent in that we have science courses without a lab.

Moved by Vessey, and seconded, **“that the Geography Program respond to the recommendations of the external reviewers as articulated in the APC Memo to Senate dated April 1, 2015. APC specifically recommends that the Department implement recommendations 3, 4, 7 and 8”.** Motion carried

Moved by Vessey and seconded, **“that the Geography Program submit an action plan to APC in June 2015.”** Motion carried

Moved by Vessey and seconded, **“that in April, 2016, the Geography Program submit a one-year report to the Academic Planning Committee on the progress made during the year on the Action Plan according to Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary’s University.”** Motion carried.

- ii) **IDS Program** review documentation circulated as: *Appendix K*– APC Notice of Motion, *Appendix L1* - Recommendation-Comparison summary, *Appendix L2* - Other Suggestions, *Appendix M* - Self Study Report, *Appendix N* - Self Study appendices (A-O), *Appendix O1 & O2* - Deans Responses to Self Study UG & Grad, *Appendix P* - External Review Committee’s (ERC) Final Report, *Appendix Q* - Department Response to ERC Report, *Appendix R* - Dean’s Response to ERC report. (Dr O’Malley attending)

Key Discussion Points:

- The members of the Academic Planning Committee consider all 16 recommendations to be valuable and worth considering. Those recommendations that are not being forward to the Senate are being referred to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and the IDS Program for consideration.
- **Recommendation #2.2(a) Undergraduate** – There appears to be an opportunity for the Program to offer a new introductory course at the 1000 level. Apart from setting the stage for recruiting students to the IDS Program at a relatively early stage of their university education, this course can also help the Program to build a solid analytical foundation for development for both IDS and non-IDS majors. (APC

agrees that an analysis of introductory offerings must include consideration of existing resources.)

- **Recommendation #2.2(b) Undergraduate** – It may be a good idea for the Program to consider organizing the courses into specific themes/clusters/streams, thus allowing students to pursue specific interests in the broad field of International Development. Students in the Program will be able to focus on particular areas of concentration based on their own academic interests and career objectives. (As per the Deans' Response.)
- **Recommendation #2.2(c) Undergraduate** - To help students more effectively plan their progress in the Program and complete the degree programs in a timely manner, the Program, with the help of the Dean of Arts, can make a concerted effort to inform the students in advance of their enrollment deadlines as to the actual course offerings. Students can also be alerted to the unavailability of courses and be given an alternative choice. (APC agrees with the Deans and encourages IDS to continue its close cooperative discussions with partners and contributing departments and programs to facilitate the availability of course offerings in a timely manner.)
- **Recommendation #2.4 (a) Graduate** – 2.4 (a) - Merge the current two categories into one MA program that is administratively and academically easier to manage. (As per 2.4 (b).)
- **Recommendation #2.4 (b) Graduate** – Align the degree requirements with competing graduate programs in International Development Studies in Canada. This would mean a reduction in the number of credits a student would need to complete in order to meet the program requirements. We suggest that the students should be asked to complete no more than 30 credits to obtain an MA in International Development. Students may also be given an option to choose from the 'thesis' or the 'MRP' streams. (Deans support a 16-month option with both thesis and MRP options.)
- **Recommendation #2.4 (c) Graduate** – A restructuring of the current curriculum (see above) may also allow the MA students to complete the program requirements in a timely fashion. We tend to think the program has an opportunity to make the curriculum more cohesive by merging a few courses and turning the DVP and the lecture series into a credit course. (As per 2.4 (b).)

Learning Environment

- **Recommendation 4.3(c)** – The IDS Program and University continue to support experiential learning and consider local options (including, for example, the Pugwash Exchange, Model UN, and local internships). (As per the Program's and Deans' Responses.).

Administrative/Organizational Environment

- **Recommendation 5.1(c)** – The University and the IDS Program discuss the benefits of contractual cross-appointments with teaching and research and supervisory responsibilities in the IDS program.
- **Recommendation 5.1(d)** Affiliated faculty members should be encouraged by their home unit to teach courses, supervise students,

and participate in relevant academic activities of the IDS Program so that it can rise into a leadership position in Development education in Canada. The cognate units should also be asked to consult the IDS Program before cancelling a course offering.

- **NOTE: Recommendations 5.1 c & d** speak to issues controlled by the Collective Agreement, which are largely outside the purview of APC and Senate. Therefore, APC encourages the program to pursue discussions between the IDS program and “cognate units” on teaching and supervisory responsibilities with the assistance of the Dean. This proposal will be forwarded to Senate in response to these recommendations.
- IDS is run on a 2.5 FCE teaching load and most faculty in the program work on an overload perspective. The program coordinator asked if Senate would support the resource requirements by sending a message through the use of words like “urge” and “encourage” action on those issues.
- Question: What does it mean to merge the MA into one program? Answer: There were two streams and we are going to merge both programs into a single 16 month program.
- Question: How practical is creating a 1000 level course? Answer: Not very. We would have to eliminate something in order to deliver that. We have a successful program and it has a good reputation.

Moved by Vessey, and seconded, **“that the IDS Program respond to the recommendations of the external reviewers as articulated in the APC Memo to Senate dated April 1, 2015. APC specifically recommends that the Department implement recommendations: #2.2(a), (b) & (c) Undergraduate, #2.4 (a), (b) & (c) Graduate, #4.3 (c), and a revised #5.1 (c) & (d)”.** Motion carried

Moved by Vessey and seconded, **“that the IDS Program submit an action plan to APC in June 2015.”** Motion carried.

Moved by Vessey and seconded, **“that in April, 2016, the IDS Program submit a one-year report to the Academic Planning Committee on the progress made during the year on the Action Plan according to Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary’s University.”** Motion carried.

Moved by Debra Gilin Oore **“that Senate continue for 15 minutes to continue the discussion.”** Motion carried.

14071

NEW BUSINESS FROM

.01 Floor (not involving notice of Motion)

Discussion about the presentation of teaching and research activities of programs and faculties on the SMU website. Key focus – the inability to convey information about academic programs or research to the wider community. Presence of a representative of the 'Steering Committee'

responsible for the SMU website is requested to elucidate on their methods of work.

Key discussion points:

- Deferred to next meeting due to lack of time.

.02 Chair

Appointment of two faculty members (not necessarily on Senate) to a Search Committee for the position of VP Academic and Research.

Key discussion points:

- Patriquin nominated Don Naulls (declined)
- Austin nominated Susan Bjornson (accepted)
- Kozloski nominated Peter Secord (accepted)
- *Referred to the Bylaws Committee:* review the process for nominating individuals on the floor of Senate.

14072 PRESIDENT'S REPORT

None

14073 QUESTION PERIOD

None

14074 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:57 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary to the Office of Senate