



One University. One World. Yours.

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

SENATE MEETING MINUTES October 20, 2017

The 586th Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, October 20, 2017, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr M. VanderPlaat, Chairperson, presided.

PRESENT: Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr Malcolm Butler, Dr Naulls, Dr MacDonald, Dr Sarty, Dr Doucet, Dr Francis, Dr Grandy, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Hall, Dr Hlongwane, Dr Khokhar, Dr Loughlin, Dr McCallum, Dr Rahaman, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr VanderPlaat, Dr Warner, Ms Ali, Ms Bhaskar Mr Oshobu, Ms Delorey, Ms Sargeant Greenwood, Dr Twohig, Dr Collins, Dr Bunjun, Ms Brown (AllNovaScotia Business Reporter), and Ms Bell, Secretary of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr Bradshaw, Dr Smith, Dr Peckmann, Ms DeYoung, Mr Brophy, Mr Nasrallah and Ms Caswell
Meeting commenced at 2:30 P.M.

17013 **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**
The report of the Agenda Committee was accepted.

17014 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
Minutes of the meeting of September 22, 2017, circulated as *Appendix A*.

Moved by Grek Martin, and seconded, **“that the minutes of the meeting of September 22, 2017 are approved as circulated.” Motion carried.**

17015 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**
.01 From May 12, 2017 - Discussion Item - Procedures for 'extenuating circumstances' such as: missed tests or midterms during term and reporting on academic dishonesty. Form attached as *Appendix Y*. (Dr Warner, Dr Sarty)

Key discussion points:

- When a student misses a test or exam, the science faculty created a form to track and address these situations. There could be many reasons for this type of behavior. This form may be beneficial in identifying students that require help or that have habitual behavior issues.
- Members were advised that this form was created during a period when there was an issue on campus with accepting sick notes. It was more useful to have a form wherein the student self-proclaimed the reason for the absence. Anytime a student had a reason to request an accommodation in a class, this form could be used. This would protect both the student and the instructor.

There are times when instructors forget agreements they make with students and this protects the student in such cases. This also tracks incidences of repetitive behavior. This allows for advising to reach out to those students to determine if they need assistance related to stress or anxiety.

- In the case of final exams, there is a separate form and process. Academic Regulation 10. Special Examinations deals with this situation.
- A suggestion was made to poll the Faculty of Arts and the Sobey School of Business to see if they were interested in creating a similar form.
- Members were advised that in the Faculty of Arts, the former Associate Dean used to handle this process informally.
- The President spoke in support of the use of this form. This process puts the onus on the students to be responsible for their actions.
- A student representative spoke in support of this form and stated that it would be helpful if there were just one form. This is because there are so many students taking courses that cross boundaries of Faculty and discipline.
- Members were advised that the Faculty of Science are in the process of streamlining this form. It may be a time for science advising to work with the other Faculty advising offices to accomplish this streamlining. The Science Advisors see many of these forms. Dr Francis volunteered to work with them to develop a universal form that could be used by all Faculties
- A student representative expressed concern related to exactly what the student would be excused from through use of this form. This would need to be clearly articulated. Response: The student can requested whatever they want, but that does not mean their request will be approved. The instructor will have to agree to accommodate the request.
- Concern was expressed regarding the concept of a university-wide form. One reason for this concern was the cultural issues that are unique to certain groups of international students.
- There was acknowledgement that it would be difficult to create a common definition. Ultimately, it is up to the instructors to decide if the request is legitimate.
- A Senator advised that at some other universities, they deal with these accommodation requests through the advising office and that could be where Saint Mary's University could assure consistency. There is a lot of protection for the student built into this process. The form allows the advisors to see what is being approved or not and allows the advisors to have a discussion with the instructors on what should, or should not be allowed.
- Brophy requested to be able to participate in this review process.
- **Action Item: Dr Francis** to work with Brophy, the Faculty of Arts, Science and Sobey School of Business advisors and bring a revised form back to Senate in January.

.02 Update: Ad-Hoc Committee to review the issue of accessibility in an academic environment. (Dr Takseva, Dr McCallum)

Key discussion points:

- The scope of this review is much larger than initially considered. Members were advised that the committee is in the process of doing this review.
- There have been two meetings. The goal is to submit a report to the Senate within the academic year.
- The President advised that the way media reported on the announcement of the new accessibility legislation, it was articulated more in terms of physical

accessibility. Universities are looking to the province for funding support to mount a university response to this legislation. Resources are needed. The committee was asked to attempt to identify some of the resource issues.

.03 Update: APC Ad-Hoc Committee on the first year academic literacy requirement, Higher Learning Foundations. (Dr Butler, Dr Takseva)

Key discussion points:

- A background was given on the development of event leading to establishing this Committee.
- The Ad Hoc Committee has undertaken to collaborate with the First Year Experience Case Committee and an agreement in principle on the development of a Higher Learning Foundations requirement for first year. The two groups have reached agreement on the type of course that would be required to address the first year component. An agreement was also reached on the learning outcomes and philosophy of such a course.
- The practical side will have to be discussed and the two individual committees will meet in the next couple of weeks to have further discussion within the individual groups on this proposal.
- Question: Will the First Year Experience Case Committee be proposing curriculum? What is the interaction of between the two groups? Answer: Any course proposals and curriculum revisions will have to proceed through the existing curriculum processes established within the Faculties and they be submitted through the Senate process. The key issue is to have a starting point for academic literacy. This would be a foundation for courses at higher levels. A collective view of those courses is key.
- Question: At one point, there was consideration of a one credit hour course. Is a one credit hour course being considered? Answer: Initially these two groups met to explore whether the two groups could agree on creating a course that would bring both the curricular and co-curricular elements together within a regular course that would satisfy the academic requirements.
- Question: When will there be a resolution? Answer: That should be available by the next Senate meeting.

17016

OUTSTANDING ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS

.01 Motions on the status of the ACC and REB as Standing Committees of the Senate, *Appendix B and C*.

Animal Care Committee

Key discussion points:

- The ACC is highly regulated by an outside regulatory structure.
- This motion is being proposed because Senate has very little ability to exercise control over what this committee does because of this external regulatory control.

Moved by Butler and seconded, “that Senate approves removing the ACC as a standing committee of the Senate with the requirement for the ACC to report annually in October through the VPAR to Senate.” Motion carried.

Research Ethics Board (REB)

Key discussion points:

- There is a slightly different situation with the REB; however, the University still has a fiduciary responsibility for this group. The question is; what is the requirement for the REB to be a standing committee of Senate?
- We have to consider that the REB performs an important function in terms of research across the university. This raises potential questions related to the implication of any proposed changes in the reporting of this committee. The REB currently has a dual reporting function. The REB impacts students and faculty on the academic issues related to research.
- Members were advised that the Deans are responsible for consulting with their faculties in situations where there is impact related to the activities of the REB. This responsibility would still exist whether the REB is a standing Committee of Senate or not. The REB would still be required to report on an annual basis through the VPAR to Senate.
- Question: What does the manner of reporting mean in this situation? Is this an item for information only or is it an item for approval? Answer: Any annual reporting to the Senate would require a presentation to Senate with the ability for Senators to ask questions.
- The annual reporting process does not preclude raising a question to the VPAR at any time during the year. There would still be annual reporting to Senate.
- Question: Would the report to the VPAR be available to Senate? Answer: This report is largely operational and would be available to the Senate members.
- Question: The REB previously reported through the Chair of Senate to the Senate. Is the only revision to reporting that it is to be done through the VPAR to Senate? Answer: Yes, but a representative of the REB would be required to attend the Senate meeting where the report was to be reviewed.
- Members were advised that, in recent years the REB has not approved operational changes through the Senate. When the Tri-Council Policy Statement changes, it requires changes in REB policies and procedures. Those revisions are implemented in the REB operational documents. These do not always go through Senate for approval.
- Question: What is the value in keeping the current reporting structure? Answer: None. As long as Senate has access to the REB, report to the VPAR there is still accountability.
- The mandate of the Senate is academic. Question: Does this mean that the mandate of research is not considered to have an academic component? Answer: No. This is more the case that there is an outside regulatory authority in control of the REB processes. Research has an academic component however; there are other activities in research with which Senate does not have a relationship.
- Question: Can you give us an example of how this would resolve an issue and therefore justify removing the REB as a Standing Committee of Senate? Answer: If something happened because of changes in policy that was not reported to Senate or to the VPAR, there could be an issue. It would be an issue if there were no single point of accountability with direct feedback to the REB. It was suggested that this is currently done through FGSR. Members were advised that the Dean of FGSR sends out a letter to any group that is in violation of the policy.

- Question: Should the motion include a representative from REB to present.
Answer: This is the existing Senate practice. Senate always has the power to request that the REB to respond back to Senate on some question.
- A friendly amendment was suggested to include in the motion that the report of the REB to the VPAR

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that Senate approves removing the REB as a standing committee of the Senate with the requirement that the REB report annually in October through the VPAR to Senate and that the report submitted to the Senate include the report from the REB to the VPAR.”**
Motion carried.

17017

.01

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic Planning

a) 2016-2017 Annual Report attached as *Appendix D - for information only*

Key discussion points:

- In the absence of questions or objections, this report was accepted into the Senate record.

b) B.Comm and B.A. Major in Entrepreneurship Program Review program review documentation circulated as: *Appendix E*- APC Memo/Notice of Motion, Recommendation-Comparison summary, *Appendix F* – Recommendation-Comparison summary, *Appendix G* - Self Study Report, *Appendix H* - Self Study appendices (1-14), *Appendix I* – Dean’s Response to Self Study, *Appendix J*- External Review Committee’s (ERC) Final Report, *Appendix K* -Department Response to ERC Report, *Appendix L* - Dean’s Response to ERC report.

Key discussion points:

- APC looked at the program review documents. Those recommendations were broken into two categories, one that did not have a relationship to the program but with the campus community. APC responded to those recommendations for which they want a response from the program.
- Program to action: Recommendation #'s 3, 9, 10, 11, 13 as per the following:
- **Recommendation 3**
Senate supports the actions already underway by the Program.
- **Recommendation 9**
Senate concurs with the Dean’s response. Senate asks the program to review all prerequisite requirements with the expectation that the program align its requirements with the program requirements of other programs within the Sobey School of Business, including admissions.
- **Recommendation 10**
Senate concurs with the Dean’s response. Senate asks the program to review all prerequisite requirements with the expectation that the program align its requirements with the program requirements of other programs within the Sobey School of Business.

- **Recommendation 11**
Senate concurs with the Dean`s response. Senate asks the program to review all prerequisite requirements with the expectation that the program align its requirements with the program requirements of other programs within the Sobey School of Business, including admissions.
- **Recommendation 13**
Senate supports the Department and Dean`s responses - to change the abbreviations for the courses in the majors from MGMT to ENTR.
- Referred for action (CASE Committee):
Recommendation #`s 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 referred to the CASE Committee on Creating Innovative, Creative and Entrepreneurial Mindsets for action and reported on by the Program in 1-Year Report. NOTE: Recommendation #4 also referred to the First Year Experience Case Committee for action/consideration.
- Referred for action (Dean):
Recommendations #8 (new hire) and #12 (funding for BDC) referred to the Dean for action and reported on by the Program in 1-Year Report.
- Referred for action (Web Steering Committee):
Recommendation #14.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the B.Comm and B.A. Major in Entrepreneurship Program submit an action plan to APC in January, 2018 based on the preceding responses.” Motion carried.**

and

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that in October, 2018, the B.Comm and B.A. Major in Entrepreneurship 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.**

c) Canadian Centre for Ethics and Public Affairs (CCEPA) APC motion and CCEPA self-study– **Appendix M-** APC Memo/Notice of Motion, **Appendix N** CCEPA Self-Study

Key discussion points:

- Academic Planning undertook a review of CCEPA. APC sees a lot of value in this centre.
- Established Centres at SMU are reviewed every five-years. That is the timeline for the next review of CCEPA.
- This is a joint group with the Atlantic School of Theology (AST). AST is going through a review of CCEPA with a very similar set of requirements. The AST Board on which our President sits will review that review.

- There is a great deal of affinity between the values of the Centre and those of Saint Mary's University.
- Opportunities for engagement should be addressed in the next five years. Members were advised that there has been discussion on this. The Board is aware of this issue and has engaged support from SMU to help.
- The potential intersection between the programs in religious studies and elements of theological studies is currently under careful review.
- A senator advised that his name is listed as a member but that he was never aware of this. Members were advised that the Academic Planning Committee questioned the list of stakeholders provided and were told that the list represented anyone that had participated in a previous CCEPA activity.
- It was noted that CCEPA does significant outreach into the community.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate accept the self-study Report of the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Public Affairs (CCEPA) as meeting the requirement of section 3.3 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 CCEPA be authorized to continue for a further period of five years from the date of review.” Motion carried.**

- d) Proposal – Reconfiguration, Department Sociology and Criminology, APC notice of motion, *Appendix O*, Proposal, *Appendix P* (Drs VanderPlaat, Collins and Bunjun attending).

Moved by Butler and seconded, “that Senate move ‘in-camera’ to deal with this item.” Motion carried.

Dr VanderPlaat recused herself from the position of Chair for this business item only. The Vice-Chair, Dr Takseva assumed the chair.

Key discussion points:

- The proposal, to reconfigure the department into three separate units, was discussed.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the reconfiguration proposal for the Department of Sociology and Criminology to create the four distinct units of Women and Gender Studies, Sociology, Criminology and Social Justice and Community Studies and approves the dissolution of the Department of Sociology and Criminology.” Motion carried.**

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Senate meeting be extended for 15 minutes to address with the balance of the agenda.” Motion carried**

- .02** Academic Appeals
2016-2017 Annual Report attached as *Appendix Q*
Key discussion points:
In the absence of questions or objections, this report was accepted into the Senate record.
- .03** Agenda Committee
2016-2017 Annual Report attached as *Appendix Q*
Key discussion points:
In the absence of questions or objections, this report was accepted into the Senate record.
- .04** Curriculum Committee
2016-2017 Annual Report attached as *Appendix Q*
In the absence of questions or objections, this report was accepted into the Senate record.
- .05** Elections Committee
2016-2017 Annual Report attached as *Appendix Q*
In the absence of questions or objections, this report was accepted into the Senate record.
- .06** Executive Committee
2016-2017 Annual Report attached as *Appendix Q*
In the absence of questions or objections, this report was accepted into the Senate record.
- .07** Literacy Strategy Committee
2016-2017 Annual Report attached as *Appendix Q*
In the absence of questions or objections, this report was accepted into the Senate record.
- .08** Library Committee
2016-2017 Annual Report attached as *Appendix Q*
In the absence of questions or objections, this report was accepted into the Senate record.

17018 **REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEES**

None

17019 **NEW BUSINESS FROM**

- Floor (not involving notice of motion)
- Senate was given notice that the EMBA program is still facing challenges and are placing enrolment in the program in hiatus for one year to reevaluate the situation.
- Senators were advised of a racist incident that occurred in a classroom on October 5. A student made an offensive comment toward the instructor on an attendance sheet circulated during the class. Incidents of racism in the classroom are on the rise. Question: To what extent are the values of the university operational in the classroom and the Senate? What support is there for a faculty member in such situations? Is there an opportunity to

include specific language in the Student Code of Conduct to address such situations?

- It is time that the University investigates the extent of racism that exists in the academic environment.

Fundraising Priorities Report – Ms Sargeant Greenwood

- President and Vice-President, Advancement will provide an update to Senate on the University’s Fundraising Priority Setting project.

Moved by Butler and seconded, “**that Senate move ‘in camera’ for this presentation.’ Motion carried.**”

Senate members were briefed on the project.

17020

PRESIDENT’S REPORT attached as *Appendix X*

Summerby-Murray advised members of the following:

- Due to time restrictions, no detailed report was presented. The President referred Senators to the report posted on SMUport.

17021

QUESTION PERIOD

Key Discussion Points:

- No questions.

17022

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary to the Office of Senate