



One University. One World. Yours.

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

SENATE MEETING MINUTES February 13, 2015

The 563rd Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, February 13, 2015, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr D. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

PRESENT: Dr Gauthier, Dr Dixon, Dr Bradshaw, Dr MacDonald, Dr Smith, Dr Vessey, Dr Naulls, Dr Power, Dr Austin, Dr Bjornson, Dr Francis, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Kozloski, Dr Secord, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr VanderPlaat, Dr Warner, Ms DeYoung, Mr Michael, Mr. Hamilton, Mr Dhudak, Mr Patriquin, and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr Dodds, Dr Campbell, Dr Gilin-Oore, Dr Short, Mr Hotchkiss, Mr Rice and Mr Feehan

Meeting commenced at 2:34 P.M.

14049 **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**
The report of the Agenda Committee was accepted.

14050 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
Minutes of the meeting of January 16, 2015, were *circulated* as *Appendix A*.
The following revisions were noted:

- Page 4 in the eighth bullet point where it states: "The student senator also noted that the Student Association is supposed to have the authority to appoint a representative". It was noted that the student representative appointment for the REB was still done through the Student Association. Moved by Patriquin, and seconded, "**that the minutes of the meeting of January 16, 2015 are approved as revised.**" Motion carried.

14051 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**
.01 Academic Regulations
Revisions to Academic Regulation 19, circulated as *Appendix B1 and B2*
Key discussion points:

- These changes resulted from a discipline case that was heard this year and involved the participation of Legal Counsel from both sides. Gaps in the process were identified and suggested revisions from the University lawyer were addressed by a subcommittee on the Regulations Committee that was chaired by Dr Smith. Those revisions have been submitted here.
- It was noted that this change would also impact graduate regulation #33.

- It was noted that informal resolution is available if there is a penalty of zero in a first instance. The process for the second instance is not identified. This was identified as a gap that needs to be addressed. If it is a second, third or more instance of dishonesty or a more serious breach of academic integrity, such instances are not addressed.
- It was noted that under Informal Resolution – “In the case of a first instance of dishonesty” the word ‘first’ has been struck and replaced with “In a case of a documented instance of dishonesty”. Senators did not think this addressed the issues noted.
- Under Procedures for Formal Complaints where it states – “For those cases that cannot be resolved informally, and the student or instructor wishes to appeal”, change “and the student” to “and/or the student”. This was considered to be a *friendly amendment*.
- The wording of AR #33 is the same in the graduate regulation as it is in the undergraduate regulation. A senator suggested that perhaps graduate academic regulation 33 needs to speak to what happens if a student comes from another institution and has a previous instance on file that Saint Mary’s does not know about.
- Question: Once the formal procedure is initiated, is there a time frame when it is supposed to be completed? The structure and timing of the hearing is established by the hearing panel and occasionally timelines are too long. There needs to be a timeline stipulated here. Answer: This is stipulated in article 5. Question: What if it is not resolved in 30 days? There needs to be a statement in Item #17 under Procedures for Formal Complaints that gives a timeline for a decision.
- There needs to be improved reporting mechanisms for the frequency of incidences. Does any record show how many incidences of informal resolution there are for any particular student? Concern was also expressed by the Deans in regard to being advised of these situations. Answer: Members were advised that the process states that any decisions levied by instructors under the Informal Resolution process are to be communicated in writing to the student, chairperson, Dean and Registrar. Concern was expressed regarding the confidentiality of these records existing in multiple files all over campus.
- Faculties should encourage their instructors to copy the Dean and Chair on decisions made under this process. More systematic tracking is necessary.
- It was noted that the decision of the Hearing Panel was final and there is no right of appeal. Question: What if new information comes to light? What if there are communication issues? If the student does not respond within 30 days, the hearing panel can decide the case without their participation in the process. Answer: There is an informal resolution form that the student has to sign. If the student doesn’t sign it there is no informal resolution and it can be appealed. It is the student’s responsibility to keep their email address up to date in the university’s records.
- In #3 a, where it states “copies of the test or paper containing..” it should be changed to read “copies of the material containing...” This was considered a *friendly amendment*.
- In #9 it states –“The Chair shall supply copies of all submissions received to both parties to the Complaint within one (1) working day of receiving the submissions.” Chairs have busy schedules and having to submit within one

day can be a significant challenge. A period of three days was suggested. This was considered a *friendly amendment*.

- It was suggested that if the hearing panel feels they need legal advice, they should be able to get that legal advice from another legal firm other than McInnes Cooper.
- Senators thought that in number 10, a period of two working days was not reasonable to be able to arrange representation by a lawyer.
- Members were informed that most instructors have an even more informal process to deal with issues of academic dishonesty and that there is no paper trail for that process.
- The proposed revision was referred back to the Academic Regulations Committee for further consideration and revision.

.02 Senate Executive Committee

Proposed revision/clarification to Article 1.4 of the Senate Bylaws, circulated as Appendix

Key discussion points:

- Discussion ensued on the following article from the Senate Bylaws which is word for word as it appears in the SMU Act.
“Academic staff” means the persons employed by the University to carry out teaching or research responsibilities (or both), and such other employees of the University as may be given academic status by the By-Laws. This does not include students employed as teaching or research assistants or otherwise.”
- Question: What does “the Assembly of Faculty” mean? Answer: The SMU Act states that “All full-time members of the academic staff shall composed the Assembly of Faculty....”
- The Senate Bylaws state: “all members of academic staff as defined in the Saint Mary’s University Act of July 1970, 2 (a) shall be eligible to vote.” This does not state that they can nominate but that is implied.
- It was suggested that full time librarians should be able to vote. Members were advised that the membership as stated in the SMU Act only stipulated the University Librarian, representing the Library on the Senate.
- Concern was expressed over the articulation and application of the Senate Bylaw articles 1.4.2 and 1.5.7 and question of librarians being able to vote.

Moved by Patriquin, and seconded, **“that the proposed revision to Article 1.4 of the Senate Bylaws is referred to the Senate Bylaws Committee with the stipulation that consultation with the University Lawyer be undertaken prior to implementation.” Motion carried**

14052

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

.01 Academic Planning

i. Chemistry one-year follow-up report, *Appendix D*

Key discussion points:

- Question: What do we do with this information? Answer: A Senate motion made one year ago required the program to report back to Senate on the progress made on their Action Plan during the year.
- Concern was expressed regarding the matter of electronic declaration of majors. An important part of the process is finding a supervisor. It was suggested that an electronic notification takes away from the relationship

between the supervisor and student. This concern will be communicated to the program.

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

- ii. **Certificate in Human Resources Management (PSYC/MGMT)** program review documentation circulated as: *Appendix E* – APC Notice of Motion, *Appendix F* - Recommendation-Comparison summary, *Appendix G* - Self Study Report, *Appendix H* - Self Study appendices (1-5), *Appendix I* - Deans 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:

- Recommendations 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9 are being put forward to Senate.
- Question: What happens to the other recommendations? Answer: They are being referred back to the Dean and the Program for consideration.
- Recommendation 4 – Question: What about upgrading students? They are technically non-degree students. Answer: If you are admitted into a certificate program that leads to a credential; that does not qualify as a non-degree student.
- We are asking students to commit a full year. Question: If it was a longer period of time, would it qualify to be a degree? Answer: A Certificate, Diploma and Degree Program all have specific credit hour requirements. That is the criteria that defines them. MPHEC are looking at formally differentiating them but currently only has guidelines that institutes may follow. These are found at the following link:
<http://www.mphec.ca/research/maritimeuniversitystatistics.aspx#undergradcertsanddiplomas>
- Question: How is collaboration going to be encouraged? Answer: It is being done under the authority of the Deans and is currently working very well.

Moved by Smith, and seconded, **“that the Certificate in Human Resources Management (PSYC/MGMT) Program respond to the recommendations of the external reviewers as articulated in the APC Memo to Senate dated February 5, 2015. Senate specifically recommends that the Department implement recommendations 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9”.** Motion carried

Moved by Smith and seconded, **“that the Certificate in Human Resources Management (PSYC/MGMT) Program submit an action plan to APC in May 2015.”** Motion carried

Moved by Smith and seconded, **“that in February, 2016, the Certificate in Human Resources Management (PSYC/MGMT) Program submit a one-year report to the Academic Planning Committee on the progress made during the year on the Action Plan according to Section 5 of the Senate**

Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary’s University.” Motion carried.

.02 Honorary Degrees Committee
Recommendations circulated at the meeting as *Appendix M*.

Key Discussion Points:

- In the essence of time these recommendations were presented to the Board at their meeting on Feb 10th and received approval subject to Senate approval today.
- Suggestion: It was noted that all of the candidates are business people. A better balance in terms of the areas of work of Honorary Degree Nominations would be desirable. Response: The Committee has limited control over the recommendations submitted. Dr Gauthier undertook to pass the request for a balance of areas of interest along to the Honorary Degrees Committee.
- There is a limit to the number of nominations that the Committee can create. A suggestion was that there should be a call for nominations within the university community to make the process more transparent. A member advised that in the past they have submitted recommendations to the Committee but they never showed up at Senate. Concern was expressed that there was no feedback to the nominator. Dr Gauthier offered to take this back to the Committee for consideration.
- Members were advised that the Honorary Degrees Committee is very conscious of gender and business focus when considering recommendations.
- Discussion concerned Joint Committees. Concern was expressed in regard to how faculty members get appointed to these Committees. The process could benefit from more transparency. The Terms of Reference for the Honorary Degrees Committee should be visible to the community. Dr Gauthier undertook to secure these and forward them to the Senate Office for circulation to members.
- A member noted that during the Winter Convocation the business nominees were awarded in the Arts/Science session and the Arts individuals were awarded during the SSB section. Question: Was this a scheduling thing? Answer: Yes. It was scheduled that way because of the commitments of the individuals being awarded.

Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the recommendations for Honorary Degrees as submitted with the exception of one identified during discussion, which will be deferred to a future date to be determined.” Motion carried.**

14053 **NEW BUSINESS FROM**
None

14054 **PRESIDENT’S REPORT**
Dr Dodds not in attendance.

14055 **QUESTION PERIOD**
No questions

14056

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary to the Office of Senate