



One University. One World. Yours.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada  
B3H 3C3  
Senate Office  
Tel: 902-420-5412  
Web: [www.stmarys.ca](http://www.stmarys.ca)

## SENATE MEETING MINUTES November 22, 2019

The 606<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, November 22, 2019, at 2:00 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr Takseva, Chairperson, presided.

**PRESENT:** Dr Butler, Dr Bhabra, Dr Francis, Dr MacDonald, Dr Bannerjee, Dr Brosseau, Dr Collins, Dr Doucet, Dr Grandy, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Khokhar, Dr McKee, Dr Panasian, Dr Power, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr Twohig, Mr Brophy, Ms Killam, Ms van den Hoogen, Ms Navas, Mr de Chastelain, Ms Klajman, Ms Nankani, Ms Witter, Professor Bateman, Dr McCallum, Dr John Irving, Dr Smith, Mr Kay, Ms Milton, Ms Sargeant-Greenwood, and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

**REGRETS:** Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr Sarty, Dr De Fuentes, and Dr Hanley.

Meeting commenced at 2:01 P.M with the territorial acknowledgement.

### **20027**      **REPORT OF AGENDA COMMITTEE**

The Agenda Committee was accepted.

### **20028**      **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Report is posted as Appendix A. The VPAR advised that the President is currently travelling out of province.

Blake Brown has been recognized by the Royal Society of Canada for his outstanding scholarship and has been named a member of The College of New Scholars, Artists and Scientists. He is being recognized in Ottawa today and the president is attending.

Thanks was expressed to the Advancement team for their work in facilitating a partnership between the Halifax Port Authority, Stewart McKelvey and CN Rail that created an endowed award to recognize the leadership of former board chair Karen Oldfield.

Senate recognizes Ms Karen Oldfield for her years of service to Saint Mary's University on the Board of Governors.

***BI*** (10 min)

- Accessibility Committees: Thanks to those who gave feedback on the proposed Accessibility Committees, particularly the Senate Standing Committee on Accessibility. Consultation with Deborah Brothers-Scott is underway to ensure the representation issues can be managed properly before finalizing. A report will be submitted to Senate on the outcomes and process for moving forward in December.
- Research Infosource Ranking: Saint Mary's held its position at number 47 in the 2019 Research Infosource Top 50 Research Universities rankings. This ranking does not take into account all forms of scholarship, with the rankings driven by metrics in sponsored research income, and research intensity (\$/faculty and \$/graduate student). Saint Mary's was one of only two universities in Atlantic Canada to see an increase in sponsored research. This echoes the good news that the AVP Research spoke to during a research recognition event held in October.
- Student Recruitment: Enrolments are down again this year. There are two means to address this – primarily recruitment of new students and improved retention of existing students. Recruitment is a primary concern. With that in mind, thanks is expressed to all the faculty and staff who participated in the two open houses this fall. There is a first phase of an initiative in recruitment underway to address this. An update in December will be provided on this initiative.
- Student Retention and Success: Students who find the classroom experience rewarding are much more likely to persist. There are many factors that impact student retention and success, for example student advising. The various offices need to be working collaboratively and effectively to ensure students do not get lost in the system and give up in frustration. A three-hour long workshop was held in October. It was facilitated by representatives from the Educational Advisory Board (EAB), with the goal to help us understand some of the key factors for building a successful support system for students and to help us find the solution that works for Saint Mary's. Better communications with the Indigenous community are being developed to find better ways to collaborate with and support indigenous students. There was extremely good buy in around the table at this workshop. We are also looking at technological tools to assist with making student advising more seamless. We are looking at how we are engaging peer mentors and looking at curricular and incentive opportunities to help them be more engaged.
- There was a conference on student enrolment and retention. One area was regulations that impede students. The conference attendees were impressed that we did this last year.
- Question: One of the factors for students having offers and not enrolling is funding. Is this being addressed? Answer: Yes. Tuitions are really not the issue. What makes a difference is how students are valued in terms of the scholarship they are being offered. We are addressing this for the next recruitment cycle.
- Question: What is the progress on the establishment of a Racism Committee? Answer: The President is not here and I do not know what progress he has made.

- Debate on scholarships versus bursary money impact. Question: What is the right mix? Answer: There is also the question of what is the right level of scholarship for a student to retain a scholarship. Both issues are under review.
- Question: Where is the major drop in enrolment? Answer: It is a mix. Our drop mirrors some of the demographic issues in the province. There have been drops in international student recruitment. Part of our strength is diversity and we continue to attempt to diversify.
- The posting is out for the African Nova Scotian/Black Student Advisor and Community Liaison (APC).
- REB and Animal Care Committee:
  - A general call for new members for the REB was done, and received a very strong and positive response. This will help the committee function effectively.

There being no objections, the annual report of the Research Ethics Board was accepted into the record.

- The ACC was occupied largely with dealing with closing out responses to recommendations from the last certification review by the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC). These are now closed. There is an opportunity now to focus on some of the administrative factors that sit outside of the committee hindering the committee's ability to function and for researchers to receive timely feedback on their protocol submissions. This is more in the area of the supports available for the faculty, staff and students involved in animal research. One area of focus is in making sure that the appropriate reviewer is contracted to do reviews so that credible and meaningful feedback can result. As you can see, the organizational chart is quite complicated, and unnecessarily so. The CCAC provides quite clear room within their guidelines for a simpler structure and we will be working on that in the coming year.

There being no objections, the annual report of the Animal Care Committee was accepted into the record.

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

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Butler asked Smith to bring together an Ad Hoc Group starting on December 10 to bring this forward.

**20030**

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

- There have been a number of Academic integrity cases. SMUSA is considering advocating for students but at this point, few students have asked for representation. The consent form now includes the SMUSA VP Academic email. We are tracking cases through the use of a spreadsheet including who is representing the student if they request it. There is a continuous conversation related to how long it takes these cases to be resolved as this can impact academic success for the student.

- SMUSA executives participated during Students NS Advocacy Week representing students' needs at the provincial level. SMUSA presented recommendations to Government on increasing weekly student loan allowances, increasing the Co-op Education Incentive, supporting students with disabilities through diversity bonus, and strengthening support for students with disabilities on campus, and modernizing education through Open Educational Resources (OERs). There has been a declining ability to support students with disabilities across the board and we are working to address this.
- The deadline for students to apply for winter convocation in the 20-21 Academic Calendar of Events is a problem and can negatively impact student success.
- Fall Break recommendations – The break is an opportunity to catch up with academics, and address any issues related to mental issues. We would like Senate to think about placing the break in the mid-point in the semester.
- SMUSA has an OER workshop during Wellness Week and are planning to continue to collaborate with Amy Lorencz in the Library on this project.
- SMUSA is also continuing to work with the Registrar's Office and the Library about preferred names within different university programs. SMUSA will be presenting a recommendation to Senate next semester on what should be taken into consideration to apply this in different platforms.
- Question: What is the argument related to the graduation application deadline? Answer: SMUSA supports moving it back to August 4 to support the review of the applications. If it is moved to September, there is only one week to review the applications, and that may not be enough time to have the application processed in time for the student to respond if necessary, by registering in courses they may need to graduate on time.
- We are attempting to look at OERs from a systematic perspective to consider how to work more effective.
- The Acting Associate Vice-President Enrolment advised that there have been 57 academic integrity cases reviewed to date. 4 or 5 were second offenses, but most were first offences. SSB has had the majority of reports and that is putting pressure on their AIO. There will be consideration as to how to address this
- We had an Academic Integrity workshop for the committees dealing with Academic Discipline, Academic Discipline Appeals Board and Academic Appeals.

**20031**                    **QUESTION PERIOD** (length at discretion of chair based on business volume)

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Handled during each presentation above.

**20032**                    **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Minutes of the meeting of October 18, 2019, were *circulated* as *Appendix D*.

Moved by Grek-Martin, and seconded, **“that the minutes of the meeting of October 18, 2019 are approved as circulated.” Motion carried.**

**BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

- .01 SMUSA Student Survey – fall break revision to Thanksgiving week, *Appendix E (if available)*.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- The survey was launched on October 28 and concluded this Wednesday.
- Students also view the fall break as an opportunity to catch up with academic components and help with midterms.
- Approximately 50% of students surveyed supported moving the fall break week to October. 35% were opposed and 15% were indifferent. The second year results were substantially against moving fall break week to October.
- Students indicated they would prefer the first semester fall break to be after midterms in October (in the middle of the semester e.g. the last week of October). This does not coincide with the Thanksgiving weekend.
- Students cited a study by McMaster that reported 69% of the student indicated that the fall break decreased their stress levels. The research supported a positive impact to mental health to provide a break between Labour Day and Christmas.
- Concern was expressed about the size of the student response sample. More time is needed for more consultation and research. There is also a need to get this right on an evidence based level.
- We are actually a 6 / 1 / 6 set up as opposed to the 7/1/7 framework (7 weeks of class, 1 week of break, 7 weeks of class) mentioned in the SMUSA Report. Thanksgiving is actually the mid-point week.
- Members were advised that the long term benefits of the breaks have never been definitively established.

- .02 2020-2021 Academic Calendar of Events, *Appendix F1* - ARC Memo, *Appendix F2* - Calendar of Events-NOV.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- The Calendar of Events represented in Appendix F2 has the Fall Break in October. Consensus was that the break should remain scheduled during the week of Remembrance Day until further research was done.
- The Academic Calendar of Events must be approved during this Senate meeting because the Registrar's Office must begin the task of building the courses in banner. We are also in the schedule 2 process now and we have to code everything. Once coding is started it cannot be changed.
- Surveying faculty on this issue is very important. Some other group other than the students should conduct this survey.
- It was suggested that the Senate Academic Regulations Committee should do the survey.
- Question: How did the decoupling of the add drop dates work last year? Answer: It confused some people and there were some complications like Hurricane Dorian occurring at that time. It makes sense from a fee perspective. With more communication to students and faculty, future years will go more smoothly.

- The Senior Director of Student Affairs & Services stated that having classes start on January 6 causes issues because there is not enough time to do orientation if administrative offices do not open until January 5. There does not seem to be any reason for the extra vacation day. It was requested that administrative offices open on January 4.
- Action Item: Senate tasks the Academic Regulations Committee to carry out a survey of the faculty and staff members to collect data in reference to the perceived impact of changing the fall break from Remembrance Day to Thanksgiving week. Academic Regulations will also collaborate with SMUSA to arrive at a definite answer to produce a report by February 2020. Update in January.

Moved by the Academic Regulations Committee, and seconded, **“that the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar of Events is approved as presented in Appendix F2 with the following revisions:**

- 1) **The fall break remains scheduled during the week of Remembrance Day, and**
- 2) **The application date for Winter Convocation remains in early August (4 August).”**

**Motion carried.**

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Registrar’s Office be authorized to revise the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar of Events subject to the university being opened on January 4, 2021.”** Motion carried.

- .03 A representative from FGSR on the Library Committee - Dr Sarty nominates Dr Gavin Fridell, [IDST].  
**Key Discussion Points:**
- Dr Fridell has accepted the nomination.
  - There being no objections, the nomination was approved.
- .04 A representative from Science on the Accessibility Committee - Dr Francis nominates Dr Jacob Hanley [GEOL].  
**Key Discussion Points:**
- Dr Hanley has accepted the nomination.
  - The nomination was approved at our October meeting pending acceptance.
- .05 A representative from Science on the Academic Regulations Committee – Dr Francis nominates Professor Luke MacDonald [EGNE].  
**Key Discussion Points:**
- Professor MacDonald has accepted the nomination.
  - There being no objections, the nomination was approved.
- .06 Discussion - clarifying the status of the Faculty of Education and the position of Acting Dean of Education with respect to Senate.  
**Key Discussion Points:**
- Butler advised that the Shapiro Report (1994) led to a reduction of the offering of education programs. Three institutions were singled out to offer these programs and SMU was not one of them. SMU terminated their B.Ed but were not required to terminate their Faculty.

- There are a number of courses in the area of Teacher’s Professional Development that we offer. The Faculty of Education does not have the same status as the other Faculties. The issue has existed since the 1960s and had not been addressed. We may need to move to a process where we more formally designate a Dean but it will still have to be attached to another role.
- The university sees the Faculty of Education as inherently valuable. The question is whether it stays as a Faculty of Education or becomes something else.
- A Senator challenged the need for a Faculty of Education. It has none of the structure or characteristics of the other Faculties.
  - There are no undergraduate students in Education
  - It has only a small grad program (and we have a Dean of Grad Studies).
  - There are no students “currently registered” in undergraduate programs in “education”.
  - If a student wants to appeal a grade there is no structure to deal with that.
- Question: What fraction of the original Faculty does the current structure represent now? Answer: The current structure might be equivalent to 5% of the original Faculty.
- We need to establish the viability of the Faculty.

Moved by Grandy, and seconded by Power, “that Senate terminate the Faculty of Education.” Motion was withdrawn by the mover.

- It was suggested that Senate create an Ad Hoc committee to review the status of the Faculty of Education and bring forward recommendations to Senate before the end of this Academic year.

Moved by Bhabra and seconded, “**that Senate create an Ad Hoc Committee to review the status of the Faculty of Education and bring forward recommendations to Senate before the end of the 2019-2020 Academic year**” **Motion carried.**

- Part of the terms of reference of this committee will be to study the implication of a motion to terminate the Faculty.
- **Action Item: Agenda Committee** to add this to the December Senate Agenda.
- **Action Item: The VPAR** will come forward with a suggested TOR and membership for that committee.

.07 Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching (SCoLT-recommendations), *Appendix G1* – Recommendation Summary, & *Appendix G2* – Annual Report (for information). (Dr Takseva)

**Key Discussion Points:**

- A document was circulated in relation to Experiential Learning. This is a SMU definition that can be used until such time as there is a decision from Government. We can organize a framework with this as a starting place.

- **Recommendation One:** Recommended that the new Academic Plan include provisions that:
  - 1) Suggest and support a clear direction for developing the Indigenization of the curriculum;
  - 2) Suggest direction and support enabling the increased engagement and recruitment of Indigenous scholars and Elders as expert carriers of Indigenous knowledge, as well as scholars from other historically under-represented groups in an effort to apply to academic and curricular matters the ethical framework of equity, diversity and inclusion;
  - 3) Suggest and support a clear direction for nurturing student persistence, retention and success especially for historically underrepresented groups of students, such as students from various Indigenous communities and students from the African Nova Scotian community; and
  - 4) Acknowledge the work of part-time faculty and their significant contribution to teaching and learning at this institution and, based on best-practices, suggest concrete supports for their teaching practice and professional development.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Butler advised that this will be considered during the development of the Academic Plan which Senate will approve.
- The specific issue of how we are engaging with the communities will specifically be addressed in the plan.

- **Recommendation Two:** Recommended that Senate approve that the University undertakes a thorough revision of the three policies — “Violence in the Workplace: Prevention and Response,” “Policy on Conflict Resolution and the Prevention and Resolution of Harassment and Discrimination,” and “Sexual Assault Policy and Procedure”— and amalgamates them into a coherent document that is meaningfully connected to the Declaration on Safe and Respectful SMU.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- We have a document but there is no way of successfully enforcing it.
- The VPAR advised that there are certain legislative constraints in this regard. Others groups that tried to merge these documents were told to decouple them.
- Sexual Assault is mandated to be a stand-alone document.
- We need a document that clearly outlines how certain acts committed against a person, group or a place based on sex, religion, race, ability of ethnicity, all relate to the offences against the safety, dignity and honour of individuals and the institution. In addition, the University should communicate/report to the community in regard to incidents.
- The Senior Director of Student Affairs & Services stated that revisions are being made to the Code of Conduct in line with this recommendation. There is also an advisory committee working in this area that will continue to provide advice.
- The Code of Conduct is being revised in this regard.
- The Senate Standing Committee on Racism is to review all university policies with the view to revising those more directly and explicitly.



Moved by Brophy and seconded, **“that Senate direct the University to undertake a thorough review and revision of the following policies: Violence in the Workplace: Prevention and Response, Policy on Conflict Resolution and the Prevention and Resolution of Harassment and Discrimination, and Sexual Assault Policy and Procedure”.** Motion carried.

- **Recommendation Three:** Recommended that a statement on inclusive language be developed to indicate the University’s commitment to those values.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Page 18 of the committee’s report has more detail on this.
- The Committee is asking Senate to give the mandate to SCoLT to work with Brothers-Scott and Byers in this regard.
- How the statement might be used is a different discussion. If it is there it can be put into action.
- Question: What is the purpose of the statement and how would it be used? How is it used in other universities? Answer: It is used for multiple purposes. At U Vic it is actually in the brand site. It will vary by institution.
- The Committee was asked to submit a draft for Senate review early in the New Year.

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the SCoLT develop a statement on inclusive language that indicates the University’s commitment to those values.”** Motion carried.

Moved by McKee and seconded, **“that the Senate meeting be extended by 10 minutes to facilitate completion of the agenda.”** Motion carried.

- **Recommendation Four:** Recommended that the University develop Plagiarism Prevention instructional resources in the form of self-guided sets of tests and/or quizzes that students can complete on their own time and that would result in students receiving a formal validation as proof they have completed them. Once something is developed SCoLT will bring this forward to Senate for approval.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- This recommendation can be found on page 19 of the report.
- The intention is for this to act as a prevention and education tool. It is proactive and preventative. There are models existing in other universities.
- The University Librarian requested that the Library be consulted during this initiative, because the content for this initiative could already exist and would only need to be formatted into a workshop.
- The Committee was requested to include the integrity officers in the development of this educational tool.
- Concern was expressed regarding who would have the responsibility for updating the content of such a prevention/educational tool?

- It was strongly advised that the AIOs be made responsible for this work. The Registrar's Office would be responsible for implementation.
- It was stated that the Registrar's Office should not be developing the content for this. The SCoLT should collaborate on developing that content.
- Members were advised that this issue was brought to SCoLT from Academic and Instructional Services.
- It was suggested that this should be sent to the Academic Discipline Committee.
- This is an educational tool for students. It is a resource that is being developed.

Moved by Takseva and seconded, "that Senate enable the University to pursue this initiative." This motion was withdrawn by mover.

Moved by Takseva, and seconded, "**that the 2018-19 Annual Report of the Learning and Teaching Committee is approved.**" **Motion carried.**

20034

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

a)

Academic Planning Committee

i) Sub Committee to review the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at SMU Report, *Appendix H1 – APC Memo, & Appendix H2 – Revised Senate Policy* (Dr Twohig).

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Members were advised that Dr Pancer was an exceptional chair of this committee.
- One of the tasks was to ensure that all academic programs are subject to review.
- A significant change to the policy is the addition of a three year report which is mid-way between the review cycles. There will now be a requirement for student feedback in the self-study report. Previously it was a soft requirement but now it is required.
- Question: What about programs that are subject to accreditation?  
Answer: The accreditation needs of a program would prevail. Program Review is schedules to be concurrent with accreditation to reduce the workload for programs that must go through both progress.
- Question: When does this change initiate? Answer: Anyone in the process is working under existing guidelines. The programs that get their notice in March 2020 will be subject to this revised policy.

Moved by Twohig, and seconded, "**On behalf of Dr. Pancer, Chair of the Academic Regulations Sub-Committee, it is moved that Senate approve the revised Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary's University, as presented in Appendix H2.**" **Motion carried.**

- There were two other recommendations –
  - The Committee recommended that Senate create a process on creating MPHEC program proposals (using the current MPHEC template from the MPHEC website) that can be consistently applied

across all faculties, and that identifies Dr Kay, Manager, Program Review as someone to assist with those proposals.

- The Committee also recommends that Senate establish a committee to develop a process to address review of academic support units. This sub-committee would consider this situation and develop a process to do this. MPHEC is asking institutions to consider this.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- APC is responsible for this. Senate tasks APC to address these recommendations. **Action Item: Bell** to forward this to the next APC Agenda.
- Senators were advised that there are a lot of units that support academic units in one manner or another (e.g. ITSS) over which APC or Senate has no authority.
- It was suggested that APC could research what other institutions are doing in this regard and bring a report back to Senate.
- Question: What did the Sub-Committee think the definition of support units was? Answer: The Library, Writing Centre, Career Counselling, Fred Smithers Centre, and others are direct support units. Others have multiple functions. A process for reviewing direct academic supports would be more appropriate. The Teaching and Learning Centre would come under the direct support mandate.
- Some jurisdictions have carried out reviews on their own.
- It might be interesting to look at universities that have on-line course delivery support. That would be an area that should be researched.

ii) ML&C One-Year Program Review Follow-up Report, *Appendix II* – APC Memo, *I2* – 1yr report (Dr McCallum).

**Key Discussion Points:**

- The first recommendation is to reduce the class sizes down to 15 which is very small. Within the department the maximum class size for different languages varies.
- Question: Why is this? Answer: This is an FCE discussion. There are more faculty members in French and they can deliver more courses to substantially more students. Spanish has two faculty members and Japanese has only one. The caps in German are higher but they are seldom realized. It is because of the nature of the programs and student demand.
- Question: If students are enthused in a class of 30, is the retention of students in a class of 30 the same as one of 50? Answer: This again depends on the course. Some courses have field schools which impact this area.
- Discrepancy between languages notwithstanding, the first recommendation is rarely realized at any university. It does not reflect the practical reality anywhere where these programs are taught. As an institution, Saint Mary's is not far off of what is typical in this regard.

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

iii) Mathematics One-Year Program Review Follow-up Report, *Appendix J1* – APC Memo, *J2* – 1yr report (Dr Irving).

**Key Discussion Points:**

- No questions.

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

iv) APC Summary - Program Review Recommendations (2018-2019) with financial or resource implications (beyond purview of APC & Senate), *Appendix K*.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- This is a summary that may be helpful to the Deans when they are looking at resource and budgetary discussions.
- Further work and consideration needs to be done in terms of ways to augment this report. APC still needs to consider ways to deal with these issues and move them forward.

v) MPHEC Modification Proposal – MBA/CPA Program, *Appendix L* (Dr Bateman).

**Key Discussion Points:**

- This moves the program to full time delivery in the classroom.

Moved by Butler, and seconded, **“that the MPHEC Modification Proposal for the MBA/CPA Program is approved for submission to MPHEC.” Motion carried.**

Moved by Butler, and seconded, **“that the Senate meeting is extended for an additional 10 minutes to complete the outstanding agenda items.” Motion carried.**

b) Accessibility Committee

- i. Revision to composition –*Appendix M1* – Accessibility Committee Memo, and *Appendix M2* – Bylaw revision proposal.

Moved by Grek Martin and seconded, **“that the revision to the composition of the Accessibility Committee is approved as submitted in Appendix M2.” Motion carried.**

c) Library Committee 2018-2019 Annual Report, *Appendix N*

**Key Discussion Points:**

- There being no discussion or objections, the report was accepted into the record of Senate.

d) Academic Literacy Strategy Committee 2018-2019 Annual Report, *Appendix O*.

**Key Discussion Points:**

- There being no discussion or objections, the report was accepted into the record of Senate.

- e) Student Discipline 2018-2019 Annual Report, *Appendix P*  
**Key Discussion Points:**
- There being no discussion or objections, the report was accepted into the record of Senate.

**20035**            **REPORTS OF AD-HOC COMMITTEES**  
None.

**20036**            **REPORTS OF JOINT COMMITTEES**  
None.

- 20037**            **NEW BUSINESS FROM**
- a) Floor (not involving notice of motion)  
Dr Twohig
- Key Discussion Points:**
- A Senator advised members that during a recent meeting, there was discussion related to the potential for Saint Mary's to recognize Academic All Canadians at Convocation.
  - The Registrar volunteered to take this back to her team for discussion and action.
  - Senators were also advised that this was also an item on an agenda for discussion with Butler and Smith.

**20038**            **ADJOURNMENT**  
The meeting adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

Barb Bell,  
Secretary of Senate