



One University. One World. Yours.

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

SENATE MEETING MINUTES December 16, 2016

The 579th Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, December 16, 2016, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr D. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

PRESENT: Dr Enns, Dr Dixon, Dr Bradshaw, Dr Singfield, Dr Vessey, Dr Naulls, Dr Campbell, Dr Conrad, Dr Grandy, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Hall, Dr McCallum, Dr Peckmann, Dr Rahaman, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr VanderPlaat, Dr Warner, Mr Brophy, Ms DeYoung, Mr Michael, Ms Jones, Mr Rice, Dr Giles, Mr Hotson, and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr MacDonald, Dr Henry, Dr Hlongwane, Mr Rahman, Ms Bhaskar and Mr Alanazi,

Meeting commenced at 2:31 P.M.

16023 **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**
The report was accepted as circulate.

16024 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
Minutes of the meeting of October 14, 2016, were *circulated* as **Appendix A**.

Moved by Vessey, and seconded, “**that the minutes of the meeting of October 14, 2016 are approved as posted.**” Motion carried.

16025 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

.01 Discussion regarding accessibility. The NS Government has advised that new accessibility legislation is pending. **Appendix U**.

Key discussion points:

- Accessibility affects all aspects of life on campus for students, faculty, and staff at Saint Mary's University, including but not limited to the academic mission that is the purview of the Senate.
- Accessibility legislation is about a new law, regulations, standards and policies that will systematically identify, remove and prevent barriers that stop individuals from full participation in all aspects of life. It focuses on ensuring everyone is able to participate equally in their communities and workplaces.
- Though it provides valuable support for students, the Fred Smithers Centre, is limited to providing individualized accommodation, and has neither the scope nor the resources to address the broader issues of accessibility.

- There are issues in the consultation process at the Provincial and Federal Levels and at the moment the legislation is at the Law Amendments Level.
- During the consultation process, concerns were raised about the law that was being proposed. The legislation will come up again for discussion in February. It has been moved to the Department of Justice at this time for further action.
- There has been a lot of discussion at the Federal Level, but it is still in the consultation process and will likely be coming in the next two or three years.
- Saint Mary's University is not accessible. This is an opportunity to be a leader in this area. The legal environment is changing and the legislation is coming.
- It was suggested that there should be participation from students and human resources on the working group that would be stuck to address this issue on campus.
- Every level is impacted within our community and it should be under the President's Office.
- Question: Explain the difference between accommodation and accessibility. Answer: Accommodation is developing approaches for individuals and identifying what their needs are. This does not mean that one-time accommodation for a student means that the university or a course is accessible. Accessibility includes physical, architectural and electronic barriers that impact the ability of people with disabilities to move freely in their environment (a good example is the door openers that function for everyone). It also includes: use of public transportation or to access information or use technology; attitudes, beliefs and misconceptions that some people may have about people with disabilities and what they can and cannot do; and outdated policies and practices that do not take into account the varying abilities and disabilities that people may have.
- Question: Would a friendly amendment be acceptable to replace Cross-Faculty Working Group with Pan-University Working Group? The friendly amendment was accepted by the mover.
- This motion goes beyond what Senate is able to do and that is why the University (President) is being asked to initiate this.
- **Action Item: Enns** will report this development to the President.
- **Action Item: Bell** to put item on the next Senate Agenda under business arising.

Moved by Campbell and seconded, **“that the Academic Senate urges the University to create a ~~cross-faculty~~ pan-university working group with a mandate to develop policies, procedures, and infrastructure to ensure that our campus is an accessible environment for all members of the University community.”** Motion carried.

.02 Working Group on Literacy Requirements Report/Recommendations, ***Appendix B1 (Notice of Motion), Appendix B2 (Report)***.

Key discussion points:

- A brief overview of this group was presented. The Cross-Faculty Working Group (CFWG) was struck in 2015 in response to a report to the Senate from the ENGL 1205 Assessment Committee that addressed the university-wide use of ENGL 1205 to address the literacy needs of all incoming students. The group was to propose options that would better serve the

university in this regard. It was widely accepted that one three credit hour course could not be expected to ideally fill the requirements of academic literacy. The CFWG was asked to present options on operationalizing recommendation #2 of the Report of the Committee on the Assessment of ENGL 1205 and also to identify the core set of academic literacy learning objectives for any University course considered to address the literacy requirements of the university. The group also reviewed the policies to identify if they could be used to further this goal. The following recommendations have been proposed.

- In Recommendation 1, Option A:
 - A single course having the FIHL code would be the sole HLF-designated course, and
 - The Higher Learning Foundations requirement would be met by passing a section of the FIHL course.
- In Recommendation 1, Option B:
 - Multiple courses with departmental codes would have the HLF designation.
 - The Higher Learning Foundations requirement would be met by passing an HLF-designated course.
- The group was looking for options across the Faculties that would provide students with the higher learning foundation requirements that the Working Group were asked to identify.

Moved by Vessey and seconded, ``**that Senate receive the report of the Cross-Faculty Working Group.**” **Motion carried.**

- Question: Article 10.1.22 of the SMUFU this is Collective Agreement is associated with appointments of faculty members. Is the CFWG suggesting that there are new faculty appointments associated with this proposal?
Answer: The inclusion of reference to this Article was done under advisement of the Registrar and the President of the SMU Faculty Union.
- Question: The proposed HLF Coordinator would need to understand that there is an existing Senate Standing Committee on Literacy Strategy and there should be a close working relationship with this committee. Answer: Section 2.7 on page 28 makes reference for the Senate Committee on Literacy Strategy.
- Question: References to a new academic program within the institution means that this should flow to Academic Planning Committee. Answer: There are other models rather than a course that would need to be housed in a Department. Department Chairs staff courses by doing the teaching assignments (assigning instructors to courses). To be consistent with the Collective Agreement, we cannot offer courses that do not belong to a Department or Program.
- The report refers to creating a Higher Learning Foundations Program but it would not provide a stand-alone credential.
- The program would be across all three faculties and would draw from all Faculties to deliver this HLF requirement. It was suggested that a process that would vet courses for this program is needed.
- Concern was expressed in regard to the resource allocations and the existing responsibilities for delivering existing accredited programs within the various Faculties. Answer: CFWG were asked by APC to consult with the

Registrar and Mr Rooney in terms of the financial and resource implications. The current terms of reference do not include this aspect. The CFWG were not tasked to explore financial implications and/or resource implementations.

- Question: Can we deal with this proposed motion in principal for now, and then establish another group to deal with the issues of implementation?
- Suggestion: Option A was a common course for everyone. Option B suggests multiple courses and if you remove the word ``new``, each department could revise existing courses with the approval of the review committee. Response: This course is intended to provide a foundation in specific literacy skills and that might get lost in the course content if it were to be included within an existing course. Concern was again expressed in regard to our resource constraints.
- Members were advised that there would be problems with staffing and also with Senate Policies. Saint Mary's University has no processes to deal with curriculum that does not reside within a discipline. New structures and processes will need to be created so that we can implement this proposal.
- An additional working group was proposed to look at what would need to be done to implement this proposal.
- Members were advised that the CFWG is putting forward an academic possibility. Recommendations 3, 4 or 5 do not contain anything that could be construed separate from the first year requirements. In addition, since this committee was struck, the President has also struck the first year experience committee.

Moved Grandy and seconded, ``**that Senate approve in principle the recommendations listed in the Committee`s Report and Recommendations to Senate dated 2 December 2016.**`` Motion carried.

Moved Enns and seconded, ``**that this report be forwarded to the Academic Planning Committee to establish a Pan University Committee to recommend strategies for implementing this report. It was recommended that membership of this committee should include any members of the existing committee if they wish to be involved.**`` Motion carried.

.03 Brightspace deficiencies: list of deficiencies with specific note to on-line testing – update.

Key discussion points:

- It has been confirmed with Desire2Learn (the manufacturer of Brightspace) that they are making improvements to their quizzing tool in the next few months but they did not describe the exact functionality yet.
- The only recommendation Desire2Learn has offered besides waiting is to engage a third party such as Respondus to use for quizzing/testing. This would be an additional cost, requiring training, and support, and would have to be reviewed carefully to ensure we select the right product that contains the right functionality prior to purchase.
- Dr Enns has asked Brian Hotson to be the lead on this file.
- The following additional issues were identified by a Senator:
 - When students do a quiz or assignment on Brightspace and do not complete it – where a grade should show it appears as grayed out. The

faculty members who discovered this anomaly had to go into all of the non-attempts, in each student's name, to see if they did attempt the task. In some cases the students had attempted the component and did have marks for the effort that was completed. Response: There is an inquiry underway currently on this issue.

- There is an inconsistency in relation to who can see the grades. A various times, the grades are able to be viewed by different people but not by everyone who should have access to view them.
- It has also been noted that students can suddenly disappear from Brightspace and appear to have withdrawn from a class but they can suddenly reappear in Brightspace at a later time during the course. They will also actually have grades for assignments that they didn't have before.
- The functionality provided from Brightspace is somewhat different than what was represented by the company. Question: What legal aspects exist in this situation?
- Members were advised that this was a consortium decision among a number of universities.
- It was suggested that the other universities must also be dealing with these problems and a collective complaint would have more weight. Response: There is already a plan in place for a meeting in the new year of those responsible for Brightspace within the other universities to address the issues with Brightspace. As well, each institution will be surveying the faculty to identify all of the issues.
- The company has advised us to wait in regard to the fixes for this diminished capacity. This seriously compromises academic integrity. We should advise faculty about the issues before they set up their testing for the next term. It may well have implications for faculty in the design of their syllabi. It also has the potential to affect our enrolments. Response: The University is in contact with D2L on this and have asked for a timeline on the resolutions. They promised to provide that in the new year. In terms of scrambling the questions, there is a workaround that we can consult with faculty to implement. D2L have promised to have it fixed within 2017.
- Question: Why is today the last day the CAT is open? The main reason is that their services are not required during the Christmas break time. The Writing Centre will be closed as well.
- There was a request that a communication be delivered to faculty in advance of the Winter term so that faculty could plan their course delivery methods. Question: Is it possible to send out this email to faculty to advise of these issues? Answer: Yes.

.04 Consistency in cataloging Theses in the repository.

Key discussion points:

- Theses catalogued on line are differentiated differently and a search is problematic. There is no consistent protocol. Response: This is an even greater problem when a student is doing a thesis under two departments. The library is working on this for a resolution.

16026

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

.01

Animal Care Committee – 2015-2016 Annual Report, Appendix C

There being no discussion or objection, the 2015-2016 annual report of the Animal Care Committee was accepted into the Senate record.

.02 Academic Planning Committee

a) CEARC 2015-2016 Annual Report, *Appendix D*

Moved by Bradshaw and seconded, “**that the Senate approve the 2015-2016 Annual Report of the Centre for Excellence in Accounting and Reporting for Co-operatives (CEARC).**” Motion carried.

b) CCEPA 2015-2016 Annual Report, *Appendix E*

Moved by Vessey and seconded, “**that the Senate approve the 2015-2016 Annual Report of the Centre for Ethics in Public Affairs (CCEPA).**” Motion carried.

c) MPHEC Termination Proposal – Diploma in Forensic Science, *Appendix F*

Key discussion points:

- A new 24 credit hour certificate has been created to replace the diploma program. It is only for students that are registered in a Bachelors Degree.
- Question: On page 2 there are 44 students remaining in the program. Have there been arrangements to allow these students to complete their programs? Answer: Yes.
- Members were advised that FRSC 3300 Application of Forensic Techniques was not offered this year and students graduating do not have this required course. They have been provided with another course but the result of that is that they are the only students in Canada that do not have this requirement for their diploma. Question: What do you do for those students. It was suggested that this question must be directed back to the program.

Moved by Singfield and seconded, “**that the Senate approve the MPHEC Termination Proposal for the Diploma in Forensic Science Program for submission to MPHEC.**” Motion carried.

d) Proposals from the Faculty of Arts for new Minors:

1. Bachelor of Arts, Minor in Indigenous Studies (Interdisciplinary), *Appendix G.*

Key discussion points:

- This reflects what has been going on across the departments in Arts. It is an interdisciplinary minor and a new direction. Arts also has an Ad Hoc Committee on Indigenous Culture.
- There isn't an approval process in place for these courses and the proposal states that these courses are approved. Where are the guarantees to the student that they are taking approved courses for these minors?
- Question: What about adequate library resources for these programs? Answer: Each course has been reviewed in terms of the required library resources.
- Question: What is the structure in regard to the interdisciplinary nature of this minor? Answer: This is similar to other interdisciplinary programs that exist on campus.

- Question: Have you considered the frequency with which these courses will be offered? Answer: There is enough growth in this area and a lot of commitment. The Faculty will have a coordinator to make sure these will work.
- Question: Are the resources available? Answer: Yes

Moved by Enns and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the proposal for a Bachelor of Arts, Minor in Indigenous Studies (Interdisciplinary).” Motion carried.**

2. Minor in Dramatic Literature, *Appendix H*.

Key discussion points:

- This Minor is capitalizing on expertise within the Department. There is a sense that there are students that would be interested in pursuing study in this area.
- The Department of English believes there is content and expertise within the Department to provide a coherent minor.

Moved by Enns and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the proposal for a Bachelor of Arts, Minor in Dramatic Literature.” Motion carried.**

3. Minor in Culture, Race and Resistance in Literature, *Appendix I*.

Moved by Enns and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the proposal for a Bachelor of Arts, Minor in Culture, Race and Resistance in Literature.” Motion carried.**

4. Minor in English Language, *Appendix J*.

Moved by Enns and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the proposal for a Bachelor of Arts, Minor in English Language.” Motion carried.**

.03 Academic Regulations Committee.

a) Undergraduate & Graduate Academic Regulations Revisions *Appendix K1, K2, K3, K4*.

1. Revision of Undergraduate Academic Regulation 19 and corresponding Graduate Academic Regulation 33, *Appendix K1*

Key discussion points:

- Remove the word ‘form’ in Initiation of the Appeals 1 (see below).
 1. Either party to the original complaint may initiate an appeal under this policy by delivering a Notice of Appeal **Form** to the Registrar.

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the revision to Undergraduate Academic Regulations 19 and the corresponding Graduate Academic Regulation 33.” Motion carried.**

2. Revision of Graduate Academic Regulation 21, *Appendix K2*

Key discussion points:

- This is to address retroactive requests for leave of absences.
- Insert the following sentence immediately after the words “while on a Leave of Absence, does not contribute to the time-for-completion.”
Students are expected to apply prior to or during the term for which the leave will take effect.

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the revision to Graduate Academic Regulation 21.” Motion carried.**

3. Revision of Graduate Academic Regulation 30, *Appendix K3*

Key discussion points:

- Lays out the process to dismissal more clearly.

c. Good Standing

(ii) Failure of one course ordinarily will require dismissal from the program. In exceptional circumstances, with a positive recommendation from the Program Coordinator, the Dean of the FGSR may allow a student who has not met these standards to remain in the program. In such a case, students will be required to demonstrate improvement within a defined period. Failure to do so will require dismissal from the program. In such a case, failure of a second course will require dismissal from the program, with the possibility to re-apply.

(iii) Failure of two or more courses will require dismissal.

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the revision to Graduate Academic Regulation 30.” Motion carried.**

4. Revision of Recruitment and Admission Services, 2 Requirements for Admission to Undergraduate Program – b. Canadian High Schools, *Appendix K4*

Key discussion points:

- Other universities in the province have less stringent requirements. This change is definitely beneficial to students in the international baccalaureate programs.
- The proposed changes are shown below:
Bachelor of Science
 - English
 - Pre-calculus Mathematics
 - 211 Science
 - 42 other academic university preparatory courses

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the revision to Recruitment and Admission Services, 2 Requirements for Admission to Undergraduate Program – b. Canadian High Schools.” Motion carried.**

b) Academic Calendar of Events, 2017-2018, *Appendix L*
Key discussion points:

- There is one amendment – in 2017 remembrance day falls on a Saturday. A number of universities in the province are having Monday as a holiday. HR confirmed that Monday will be the holiday for Saint Mary's University. The fall Break is from Friday 10 November until Tuesday, 14 November. This will impact those courses that are only taught on a Monday night.
- Question: What typically has been given for Fall Break – two days. Answer: Yes.
- Question: Do we coordinate the timing of winter break with Dal? Answer: We did coordinate with the previous Registrar at Dal. They now have a formula that they use that sometimes gets out of sync with the other universities. Most of the institutions are now timing this break with the week of Heritage Day.
- We are attempting to have the Christmas Closure date coincide with the last date for grades to be submitted by faculty.

Moved by Peckmann and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the 2017-2018 Academic Calendar of Events as revised.” Motion carried.**

Moved by Dixon and seconded **“that the Senate meeting be extended for 15 minutes to address the final business items.” Motion carried.**

.04 Continuing Education Annual Report, *Appendix M*

Key discussion points:

- University Prep courses are attracting students into the university and we are looking to expand this.

There being no objection, the 2015-2016 annual report of the Continuing Education Committee was accepted into the Senate record.

.04 Curriculum Committee 2015-2016 Annual Report attached as Notice of Motion - *Appendix N1 through N5*, FGSR report – *Appendix N2*, SSB report – *Appendix N3*, Faculty of Arts report – *Appendix N4*, Faculty of Science report – *Appendix N5*.

Key discussion points:

- The Committee Chair commended the Faculty of Science for coordinating each of their program calendar entries so that students will find it easier to understand all of the science programs.

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the 2016 Curriculum Report.” Motion carried.**

.06 Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning 2015-2016 Annual Report attached as *Appendix O* (info only).

There being no objection, the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning 2015-2016 Annual Report was accepted into the Senate record.

16027

REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEES

Report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Further Development of the Institutional Strategic Plan (ISP), *Appendix P.* (K. Vessey)

Key discussion points:

- The Ad Hoc Committee attempted to consult as widely as possible.
- On page one of the ISP there are four “high-level themes” that do not match the titles of four themes presented in subsequent pages. The Committee recommends the high-level theme and the titles of the themes subsequently in the document be aligned. Theme 1 (Values) discusses our values and ends with Goals and Objectives. The other three themes include a section on “Possible Institutional Directions”. The first theme might be strengthened by a clearer articulation via a section on institutional directions.
- A Senator posed a number of detailed questions about Experiential Learning as a “Possible Institutional Direction” under Theme 2 (Discovery and innovation in a learning-centered environment). While these were well posed questions about service learning, they were directed more to an operational level than a strategic level. As such, it was decided that these questions would be directed to the Community and Student Engagement (CASE) Committee on Service Learning being led by Dean MacDonald.
- There is a paragraph on page 8 with the following statement: “We have students from 119 countries, we actively recruit in 30 countries, and we have engaged partners to work with the university in 30 more – this has been the result of hard work.” There was some concern expressed that the University needs to work diligently to ensure that international applicants are treated fairly and with transparency by its official agents in other countries. Perhaps such a statement could be added to the “Possible Institutional Directions” on page 9 to read “We will continue to build on our international recruitment efforts and ensure that recruiting agents working on our behalf treat applicants fairly and in a transparent manner.”
- In the section on intercultural development (page 7) it is stated that “Saint Mary’s is known for its excellent support services for international students in Canada.” Also on page 8, it states: “Saint Mary’s will continue to identify ways to increase engagement, and we will celebrate and nurture the success of our international students.” Some concern was expressed that many international student, despite meeting the minimum English language proficiency entrance requirements, struggle with their English and cultural adjustment to Canada. Perhaps the statement on page 8 can be fortified to speak to increased English language and interculturalization support in particular.
- This is the President’s Strategic Plan and they will be provided to the President for information.

There being no objection, the report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Further Development of the Institutional Strategic Plan (ISP) was accepted into the Senate record.

16028

NEW BUSINESS FROM

.01 Floor (not involving notice of motion)

2016 Report on Positive Action to Improve the Employment of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible minorities, and People with Disabilities at Saint Mary’s University, *Appendix Q.*

Key discussion points:

- Article 10.4.8 of the SMUFU Collective Agreement states “The Employer shall report in writing annually to Senate and to the Board of Governors by 1 December, on actions taken to improve the employment of members of the four groups specified in 10.4.1 in the university community, and in particular the development and implementation of the hiring goals required for academic units. Such reports shall also be forwarded to the Union.”
- This report is prepared through close consultation between the Office of the Vice-President Academic & Research, HR and the Deans.
- This is a report on the 2015 year. The data is reported based on labour markets standards to identify where the university has gaps relative to labour market norms. For a gap to be considered significant, the gap must be -3 or greater and the percentage gap must be or 80% or less of the market expectation. There is no significant gap for the full time faculty or professional librarians. Underrepresentation is noted within specific groups.
- There is a university position of Diversity and Inclusion Advisor (APC) that is currently posted to address this requirement.
- Page 8, 9 and 10 list positive actions taken with 22 bullet points.
- It was noted that items 15, 16, 18, 19, 20 do not appear to have anything to do with improving employment of the identified groups. Response: The emphases was of wider breadth in terms of changing the university culture.
- Question: Is there any intention to provide an employment equity plan for the university? Answer: The job ad for the position of Diversity and Inclusion Advisor has a very broad mandate and is intended to bring leadership to the university. There is also an employer union committee that has been struck and is meeting on these issues.

There being no objection, the 2016 Report on Positive Action to Improve the Employment of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible minorities, and People with Disabilities at Saint Mary’s University was accepted into the Senate record.

- .02** Floor (involving notice of motion)
Proposed Senate By-laws revision – Section 2.2, attached as *Appendix R & S*
Key discussion points:

- It is proposed to insert the following text as subsection 2.2.2:
Cancellation of a regularly scheduled meeting may be called by the Chairperson upon consultation with the Agenda Committee (or in compliance with University Policy 5-1002 Policy on Unscheduled Closure and/or Cancellation of Classes, Section 4.1).

Moved by Vanderplaat and seconded, “**that the Senate approve the revision to Section 2 Conduct of Meetings, 2.2 Meetings, 2.2.2 as show above.**” **Motion carried.**

16029 **PRESIDENT’S REPORT Appendix T**

Key Points:

- This report was posted on SMUport for the information of Senators.

16030 **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:41 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary to the Office of Senate