

SENATE MEETING MINUTES January 20, 2023

The 640th meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, January 20, 2023, at 2:00 PM, in CLARI, Atrium room 340. Dr Grandy, Chaired.

PRESENT: Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr VanderPlaat, Dr Bhabra, Dr Ingraham, Dr Sarty, Dr Veres (for Dr Francis), Dr Austin, Dr Brosseau, Dr Fan, Dr Grandy, Dr Hare, Dr Irving, Dr Kocum, Dr O'Brien, Dr Stinson, Dr Ylijoki, Dr Al Zaman, Dr Zhyznomirska, Dr Barclay, Dr Power, Mr Brophy, Mr Peters, Ms van den Hoogen, Ms Tyler, Ms Meyers, Mr Wilson, Ms Mihika, and Ms Bell, Secretary of Senate.

GUESTS: Dr Dansereau (3pm), Dr Weir, Ms Milton, Ms Sargeant-Greenwood

REGRETS: Dr Sanderson, Dr Francis, Mr Sogy

The meeting was called to order at 2:04 pm. Dr Grandy chaired and provided a territorial acknowledgement.

23053 REPORT OF AGENDA COMMITTEE

The Agenda Committee report was accepted. The President's report will be delayed until his arrival. The Parliamentarian advised that Senate follows Robert's Rules of Order. Points of procedure were explained.

23054 PRESIDENT'S REPORT

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

- Deferred to later in the meeting due to a scheduling conflict.

Key Discussion Points:

The President referred to the report included with meeting materials and highlighted the following:

Intercultural Learning

- There is significant work going on within the area of Indigenous affairs.
- There are on-going and significant challenges within the post-secondary sector relating to the recruitment and the support of international students. National media are providing increasing coverage of these challenges. Senators were encouraged to review a report by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (link <https://heqco.ca/pub/matching-rapid-growth-with-adequate-supports-how-colleges-and-government-can-enhance-international-student-experiences-in-ontario/>).

Institutional Sustainability

- There are still budget challenges and cost reduction measures will need to be continued to year end.

23055

VICE-PRESIDENT ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH REPORT

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

Key Discussion Points:

- The enrolment numbers were shared.
- Welcome Week and a the Santamarian Ceremony were a success.
- The search for an AVP Enrolment Management and Registrar will begin January 24. The search committee composition is in the report.
- The search for Dean SSB has started. KBRs is the Executive Search firm. The search committee composition is also in the report.
- The Ad Hoc Review Committee – Education has been initiated.

23056

SMUSA PRESIDENT’S REPORT (Academic focus)

Listed as **Appendix C** but presented verbally only (5 min).

Key Discussion Points:

- Students want more online class offerings through the summer sessions.
- Students also ask that Senate consider how late in the semester an instructor can change the method of teaching a course. When instructors make these changes midway through a course it creates significant issues for students.

23057

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

Key Discussion Points:

- Members supported student concerns related to faculty changing the method of instruction after the course starts.
- Members were also advised of accessibility complaints related to sudden changes in the method of course delivery. These changes are affecting students with other needs.
- Discussions are underway on whether courses can be offered at alternate times like evenings or weekends. Students want the option of weekday evening courses and more of them.
- There are two kinds of delivery mode changes, 1) temporary changes due to exceptional circumstances, and schedule 3 change requests that go to the Dept Chair/Dean and have to be approved. **Action Item: The Academic Regulation Committee** was tasked to look at this issue.
- The delivery aspect is not covered under the regulations but there is a process within the faculties. Instructors cannot just change the method of course delivery on a whim.
- This is also an excellent discussion for the Accessibility Committee. If a professor has an accessibility need there is a process to follow. Changing course delivery mid-way through a course should only be a temporary thing. There needs to be an accommodation for things like sickness and students may not know this. At times, issues that are accessibility related can be perceived as performance issues, and that can be harmful.
- Question: Why is there a decline in FCEs in the statistical report? Answer: The FCEs are reported in terms of the number of courses students are taking. Students are taking fewer courses.
- It was noted that there is an issue with the Calendar of Events Senate approved for 2023-2024. Senate approved a Friday as the alternate day for

the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. The Province of Nova Scotia has designated the holiday on October 2nd (Monday). This will cause an issue for faculty/staff/students that have children in the NS school system that have the holiday on Monday and not Friday.

23058 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting of November 18, 2022, were *circulated* as **Appendix D**.

Key Discussion Points:

- Correct the spelling of Dr Ylijoki's name.
- Delete the last sentence in the last bullet point in the VPAR report ("It was traditional ...")
- In 23043, second bullet point, delete the last sentence. ("It is challenging....").

There being no objections or further revisions, the minutes of the Senate meeting of December 18, 2022, were accepted as revised.

23059 WINTER GRADUATION LIST

Documentation circulated at the meeting by Mr Peters, Acting Registrar as **Appendix E 1 & E 2**, (Hard copies to Deans and Senate Office File only)

- Winter Graduation Statistics were circulated and the grad list was shared.

Moved by Peters, and seconded, **"to confer degrees and distinctions on those represented on the list (circulated as Appendix D) at the Winter Convocation"**. Motion carried.

Moved by Peters, and seconded, **"to enable the Acting Registrar to add such graduates as may be identified subsequent to this meeting."** Motion carried.

23060 PROFESSOR EMERITA RECOMMENDATION

Professor Emerita Recommendation, **Appendix F1-5**

Key Discussion Points:

- This comes from the department, through the VPAR and President to Senate. If approved, it will move forward to the Board for awarding.
- Who notifies the faculty member? Once the Board has approved it, the President's Office notifies the faculty member.

Moved by Summerby-Murray and seconded **"that Senate approves the recommendation for forwarding to the Board of Governors according to 8-1001 Senate Policy – Professor Emeritus."** Motion carried.

23061 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

a) Curriculum Committee (Mr Peters),

- i. Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Commerce, and FGSR Curriculum Submissions **Appendix G1** - Notice of Motion – **Appendix G2** - How to Review Instructions, **Appendix G3**, Science Program Submissions, **Appendix G4** - Arts Curriculum Submissions, **Appendix G5** – Commerce Curriculum Submissions, **Appendix G6** - FGSR Curriculum Submissions, **Appendix G7** – Faculty of Education, **Appendix G8** – Glossary revision, and **Appendix G9** – January addendum report.

Key Discussion Items:

- Question: Are the course changes in the Certificate for Human Remains Curation approved for the Academic Calendar? Answer: Yes.
- Question: Members asked how to find graduate course revisions in CourseLeaf? Answer: Peters explained that the information could be found in another TAB in the G9 addendum submission.
- The only change to the courses included in the HRC Certificate was that they were going to be offered online. **Decision:** The existing four ANTH courses can be excluded from the report.
- Question: Were the modifications to the education courses description only or did they include a prerequisite change? Answer: These are part 1 and 2 of the same course. The change to the description was to clarify between 2100 and 2101.
- Question: Clarification was requested. Will regular SMU undergraduate students be admitted? Answer: Yes.
- Nowhere in Educ 1100 and 1101, does it say that it is for students coming out of the language school. Response: The title of EDUC 1101 is changing to Educational Issues for English as an International Language.
- It was noted that the path for this approval is really short compared to other faculty changes. There are several more levels that other curriculum revisions go through compared to those of Education. If this had been a submission from any other discipline, questions like this would have come up before a submission came to the Senate. **Decision:** Remove EDUC 1101 & 1102 from Appendix G7,

Moved by Peters and seconded, **“that Senate approves the curriculum materials contained in appendices G3 through G9 excluding 1) the four existing ANTH courses (2273, 2315, 3471, & 3475) relating to the Certificate HRC in App G4 and 2) EDUC 1101 & 1102 in Appendix G7, for publication in the 2023-2024 Academic Calendar.”** Motion carried.

23062

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

1. Academic Planning Committee (Dr Madine VanderPlaat)
 - a) Biology Program, One-Year Report, Appendix H1 (Dr Dansereau & Dr Weir - 3 pm) – Notice of Motion, **Appendix H2** – BIOL One-Year Report.

Key Discussion Items:

- Dansereau advised that the focus has been to ensure students gain the required skills within the first two years in the program. The Department is very happy with the outcome of this review.
- The department was commended for the manner in which the review was handled / addressed.

Moved by VanderPlaat and seconded, **“that Senate approves the one-year follow-up report of the Biology Program as meeting the requirements of Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs at Saint Mary’s.”** Motion carried.

- b) Geography Program – APC Notice of Motion, **Appendix I1**, Proposal for a Minor in Climate Change Studies, **Appendix I2** (Dr Cathy Conrad – 3 pm)

Key Discussion Items:

- No Questions.

Moved by VanderPlaat and seconded, **“that the Senate approve the proposal from the Department of Geography for a Minor in Climate Change Studies”**. Motion carried.

- c) 2021-2022 Annual Report, *Centre for Leadership Excellence (CLE), , APC Notice of Motion, **Appendix J1**, CLE Annual Report, **Appendix J2**
- d) 2021-2022 Annual Report, Institute for Computational Astrophysics (ICA), Revised, APC Notice of Motion, **Appendix K1**, ICA Response to APC, **Appendix K2**, ICA Annual Report, **Appendix K3**.
- e) 2021-2022 Annual Report, Centre of Excellence in Accounting and Reporting for Co-operatives (CEARC), APC Notice of Motion, **Appendix L1**, 2021-2022 CEARC Annual Report, **Appendix L2**, and self-study, **Appendix L3**.
- f) 2021-2022 Annual Report, Centre for the Study of Sport and Health and Health (CSSH), APC Notice of Motion, **Appendix M1**, CSSH Annual Report, **Appendix M2**.
- g) 2021-2022 Annual Report, CN Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (CNCOHS), APC Notice of Motion, **Appendix N1**, 2021-2022 Annual Report, **Appendix N2**

Moved as an omnibus motion by VanderPlaat and seconded, **“that the 2021-2022 annual reports for the Centre for Leadership Excellence (CLE), Institute for Computational Astrophysics (ICA), Centre of Excellence in Accounting and Reporting for Co-operatives (CEARC), Centre for the Study of Sport and Health (CSSH), and CN Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (CNCOHS) are accepted as meeting the requirements of section 3.2 of 8-1009 Senate By-Laws Governing the Establishment Reporting and Review of Research Institutes and Centres at Saint Mary’s University.”** Motion carried.

Moved by VanderPlaat and seconded, **“that the self-study for the Centre of Excellence in Accounting and Reporting for Co-operatives (CEARC) be accepted as meeting the requirements of section 3 3.3 b of 8-1009 Senate By-Laws Governing the Establishment Reporting and Review of Research Institutes and Centres at Saint Mary’s University.”** Motion carried.

Appendix K2 – is the program response to questions from the APC related to their response. This is an addendum to ICA annual report.

- APC requested more information subsequent to their annual report and this was the response to that inquiry.
- APC was satisfied with this response. It is noted that the policy that relates to these centres and institutes needs to be reviewed and updated. **Action Item: Senate tasked APC** with the review of this policy.
- Question: Paragraph 4 – It is noted that the institute’s fundraising plan needs to be put on the SMU Advancement’s fund-raising priority list. **Action Item: Sargeant-Greenwood** will follow-up.
- Question: Paragraph 5 – Why was a nationally funded resource (a 2nd term the appointment of the Tier I Canada Research Chair affiliated with the Institute)

removed from ICA. Answer: This was an external decision to the University and beyond our control. We successfully argued for retaining the funding until the end of the terms of the two existing chairs.

.02 Academic Regulations Committee

i. Graduate Academic Regulation #16 Program Requirements, **Appendix O.**

Key Discussion Points:

- The goal of this revision is to establish the requirement for a supervisory committee (SC) and establish timelines around when the committee should be formed. This submission was approved by the FGSR Executive, the FGSR Council, and by the Senate Academic Regulations Committee.
- There is no impact to undergraduate regulations.
- Question: Why are we seeking approval for supervisory committees?
Answer: In practice these have always been formed but there was no policy guiding it.
- Question: What about the issue of co supervision in d.? It is only allowed in exceptional cases and must be approved by the GPC and the Dean FGSR.
Answer: When there are co-supervisors, the burden on the student increases. We only want to do this when there is a case that makes it appropriate.
- Question: 16 d – Why is the limit for thesis students 8 months and for PhD programs it is 12 months, and why so late in the program? Answer: A number of programs considered these timelines too early, but we managed to gain agreement for them. It was important to update the calendar to identify the importance of establishing a supervisory committee.
- Support was expressed for early establishment of these committees.

ii. Undergraduate Academic Regulation #3 Academic Advising, **Appendix P**
Key Discussion Points:

- Updated to reflect current practice. There is no impact to the corresponding graduate AR #6.

iii. Undergraduate Academic Regulation 7 Standing Required, **Appendix Q.**
Discussion Points:

- Section e. Note (iii): Due to the term-based nature of coding academic standing in Banner, a student's academic standing may not be retained permanently on a student's academic record. For example, a student who returns on probation after suspension in a January-April term will have their academic standing coded on that term. However, if they receive a different academic standing upon the completion of the January-April term and are not registered in May-June courses, the students' new academic standing will replace their previous one on their official academic record. Suggest removal of current statement, which is inconsistent with current operations.
- Section g. Suspension Period: clarification of academic standing assessment cycle, process, and suspension timeline.
- Section h. Dismissal Period:

Currently, academic suspension and dismissal periods are the same. The dismissal period should be longer to allow students more time to optimize their return to the University and would be consistent with other institutes.

- Current Period: May – January (same as academic suspension)
- Suggested Period: May 1 – April 30 to differentiate between suspension and dismissal penalties. As per suspension, students enrolled in May term prior to academic standing assessment may choose to stay enrolled.
- Section 7 i: Appeal text edited to include dismissal, labelled as distinct section.
- There is no impact to the corresponding Graduate Academic Regulation 30.

iv. Undergraduate Academic Regulation 14 Declaration or Change of Major, Area of Concentration, Honours, or Minor, **Appendix R.**

Discussion Points:

- Updates to reflect current process/practice.
- Added subsection (f) to address honours as the above process is relevant for dropping honours, but not adding, since Honours application is a different process than major/concentration declaration.

Moved as an omnibus motion by VanderPlaat and seconded, “**that Senate approves the revisions to**

- **Graduate Academic Regulation #16 Program Requirements,**
- **Undergraduate Academic Regulation #3 Academic Advising,**
- **Undergraduate Academic Regulation #7 Standing Required,**
- **Undergraduate Academic Regulation #14 Declaration or Change of Major, Area of Concentration, Honours, or Minor.**

as submitted in Appendices O, P, Q, & R.”

Motion carried.

v. Undergraduate Academic Regulation 18 and Graduate Academic Regulation 33, **Appendix S.**

Discussion Points:

- Minor editing changes.
- The following revisions were made:
 - Examples of academic honesty were added,
 - References to external “tutoring” or “solutions” websites (=contract cheating sites) were added,
 - Expanded ‘Tampering’ definition,
 - Revised language to include the new AI Administrator’s role.
 - Details about the AIO general procedure and about cases arises from group work were added,
 - Added a description of Procedural Fairness, revised language to include AI Administrator’s and University Secretariat’s roles, and
 - Changed chair-ship of AIAB to remove Senate Chair (conflict of interest with Senate Executive).

- These changes came from the AIC.
- The AI administration has been changed as of last summer and the new process is working very well. The process in AR 18 must be aligned with our current practice.
- The regulations did not explain natural justice but referred to the grounds of natural justice. That had to be addressed.
- Question: Is there any reference to the use of Artificial Intelligence where integrity is concerned? Answer: No. That news item broke recently, and this revision was drafted in November.
- Question: Is the AI Foundation course always required? Answer: The AIO does not always recommend the AI Foundation courses. The library recommended alternate ways to address individual's situations other than the AI Foundation courses. The library courses were not meant to be used for remedial purposes. They were intended to be educational. The hope of the library is that the foundations course will become a requirement for all students.
- The following friendly amendment was suggested: Blatant copying of lab reports is not listed as an example. After the sub-title "Examples of Academic Offences" it should say "but are not limited to". Members were advised that if you read the second sentence in italicized text at the beginning of the section, it states "the list is not exhaustive".
- On page 3 of this appendix, the fifth bullet point in the list after the text "Honest and ethical behaviour includes:" at the end of the bullet point delete "lab assistants or academic advisors" and replace with "of record" after the word 'instructors'. Consensus was to accept this friendly amendment.
- On page 7 under the sub-title Academic Integrity Officers (AIO) the second last bullet point from the bottom should be revised to read
Notice that if the student fails to respond to the AIO within 10 days, or appear at a scheduled meeting the matter will be referred to the Academic Discipline Officer (ADO).
- Immediately following the statement of values at the beginning of the regulation, there is a paragraph that states "At times there may be considerable pressure" Within this paragraph there is the following, "Students are expected to know what constitutes academic integrity," Perhaps there should be a statement here that faculty are encouraged to incorporate the AI Foundations modules in their instruction of the course. A concern was expressed that such a statement might open the door for academic appeals. This may be a discussion for the Curriculum Committee as they address the policy on course outlines. Consensus was that this should not part of the regulation.
- Question: Is it possible to provide suggested language to the ARC with regard to revisions of the language used in the Academic Regulations? Answer: Yes. Send suggestions to the Academic Regulations Committee through the Senate Secretary. If members have suggestions for revisions to the language in the Policy on Course Outlines, they should send those to the Curriculum Committee through the Senate Secretary.

Moved by VanderPlaat and seconded, **“that Senate approves the revision to Undergraduate Academic Regulation 18 and Graduate Academic Regulation 33 as submitted in Appendix S (with the discussed amendment).” Motion carried.**

vi. Revision, ARC Terms of Reference, Composition, Senate Bylaws 5.2.5, ***Appendix T***

Discussion Points:

- Annual review of Academic Regulations Committee Terms of Reference as required by the Senate Bylaws.
- Membership revisions: 1) Deans (Arts, Business, Commerce, and FGSR) participate on Academic Regulations. No need for a separate line for Dean, FGSR. 2) Delete line for an elected member of Senate. The Deans, VPAR and Registrar all serve on Senate which is enough of a connection. 3) Addition of University Librarian (or designate). 4) Addition of non-voting/observer representatives of Registrar’s Office and Academic Advising Unit. 5) Correction of typographical error and removal of gender identification.

Moved by VanderPlaat and seconded, **“that Senate approve the revisions to section 5.2.5.2 of the Senate Bylaws – Composition of the Academic Regulations Committee.” Motion carried.**

.03 Accessibility Committee - Memo (Terms of Reference) (Dr Brosseau), *Appendix U.*

Discussion Points:

- Summarized the main questions of the committee below:
 - Question: Is this committee needed? Answer: This committee is necessary. There are accessibility concerns that only relate to academics. Identification and consideration of those concerns fall directly within the mandate of this group.
 - It was suggested that this group needs assistance to navigate this area of responsibility. Guidance is needed that is sensitive to the complexity of this task.
 - Question: Should this committee be tasked with academic accommodations, policy development? Does it have the jurisdiction? Answer: The task is definitely appropriate for this committee, but the jurisdiction/approval process belongs to Senate. Senate delegates this committee to recommend policy for consideration and approval.
 - Question: If there were a problem with an academic accommodations policy, what would be the process? Answer: It is expected that if a problem arose, it would be unique and individual. The response to that situation would be the same as to any other process or policy.
 - Question: In the Accessibility Plan 2022 it states, “Establish a standing Committee on Academic Accessibility to identify and recommend methods to remove accessibility barriers throughout the units that support teaching, learning, and research.” Can this be part of a revised mandate? Answer: Yes. Collaboration with the campus Accessibility Advisory Committee would also be necessary.

- It was noted that the campus Accessibility Advisory Committee is linked with this committee through the committee representative. The AAC has links with all the pillars that are in the plan but the Advisory Committee is not tasked with enacting the plan.
- Question: What is the status of an accommodations policy in any form on campus now? Answer: Work in progress.
- It was noted that the Fred Smithers Centre is not equivalent to an Accessibility Centre as articulated in the plan.
- It was requested that the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Accessibility be supported with training. There should also be representative members of various disability groups participating on this committee.
- The Senate Standing Committee needs a knowledge of what is stigma based attitude and what are legitimate accessibility issues.
- Does this committee need to address classroom spaces? The committee needs to have specific guidelines and parameters around their areas of responsibility.
- Question: What was meant by multiple jurisdictions? Answer: The responsibilities to the Board/Senate etc. and also responsibilities to other internal and external authorities and /or groups.
- SMU had committed to hire a high-level accessibility lead. The university is creating a job description for this position. They would report to Ms Benoit and the VPAR.
- The language in the existing mandate includes advising and training. The committee does not see this as fitting within their mandate. There are a number of gaps in policy in this regard.
- The committee was encouraged to consider the existing and suggested mandates and author something for the committee for the consideration of Senate.
- The Accessibility Committee members were commended for their ongoing willingness to move forward with this mandate.

**.04 Agenda Committee, Memo re Transcription Services (Stinson), Appendix V.
Discussion Points:**

- Deferred to February

23063 NEW BUSINESS FROM

a) Floor (not involving notice of motion)

- i. 2022 Report on Positive Action to Improve the Employment of Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible minorities, and People with Disabilities at Saint Mary's University, (Dr VanderPlaat) **Appendix W (if available)**

Key Discussion Points:

- This report was not available. The process used to generate this report is being reviewed by the Office of People and Culture.

23064 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

