



One University. One World. Yours.

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

## SENATE MEETING MINUTES November 6, 2015

The 569<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, November 6, 2015, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr D. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

**PRESENT:** Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr Gauthier, Dr Dixon, Dr MacDonald, Dr Smith, Dr Naulls, Dr Austin, Dr Conrad, Dr Bjornson, Dr Gilin-Oore, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Hlongwane, Dr Stinson, Dr Suteanu, Dr VanderPlaat, Mr Gordon Michael, Mr Armony, Mr Rice, Ms Collette Robert, Dr Barber, Dr Cameron, Dr MacNeil and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

**REGRETS:** Dr Vessey, Dr Bradshaw, Dr Campbell, Dr Kozloski, Dr Peckmann, Dr Takseva, Dr Warner, Mr Hotchkiss, Ms DeYoung, Mr Ali Algermozi, and Ms Vishwa Bhayani.

Meeting commenced at 2:37 P.M.

**15022**      **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**  
The report was accepted as circulated.

**15023**      **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**  
Minutes of the meeting of October 9, 2015, were *circulated* as **Appendix A**.

Moved by Bjornson and seconded, **“that the minutes of the meeting of October 9, 2015 are approved as circulated.” Motion carried.**

**15024**      **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTE**

**.01**      **Senate Sub-Committee on the University Website** report and discussion (to include participation by the Saint Mary's University Web Steering Committee)  
**Key discussion points:**

- Senate sub-committee requests item deferred to December Senate meeting.

**.02**      **University Budget Committee** membership (President to inquire re the potential of providing an alternate for the faculty representative).  
**Key discussion points:**

- The President advised that this is an advisory committee. It's composition is not set in stone. This is already a fairly large committee so adding members is not desirable but the university is open to having an alternate members provided to attend if and when the appointed representative is not available.

- Decision deferred to next Senate meeting. **Action Item: The Senate Office** will circulate a call for expressions of interest. An alternate will be appointed from the resulting list.

**.03 Honorary Degrees Committee**

Criteria for awarding Honorary Degrees. Review and construct a terms of reference. (Discussion deferred until after the first meeting of the 2015-2016 Academic Year).

**Key discussion points:**

- President reported that this committee has met and the review of the TOR is underway. The review includes a discussion of the process. Further information to follow.

**15025 REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

**a. Academic Planning Committee**

- Diploma in Engineering – APC Memo, *Appendix B1*, one-year follow-up report, *Appendix B2* (D. MacNeil attending).

**Key discussion points:**

- There are continuing space and equipment limitations.
- Question: On page 4 under the heading physical space and safety the report discussed safety issues. Have these been addressed?  
Answer: As of today these issues have been resolved.

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

**b. 2014-2015 Annual Report, Academic Discipline Committee, *Appendix C* (D. Naulls)**

**Key discussion points:**

- Question: What is the difference between cheating on an exam versus Cheating on a midterm? Answer: None
- Question: What is self-plagiarism? Answer: A student did not cite their previous paper, which they had submitted for credit in another course.
- Questions: What about the instances of fraud or impersonation? What about students that claim they are ill when they are not. Answer: No instances were identified this year.
- There is some language at end of the report that states that we need to pursue a fact-finding process to better inform ourselves (as an institution) of the commercialization of academic dishonesty services available to student, and to develop procedures to minimize their use and to be able to detect those infractions of the Academic Regulation on Academic Integrity. Question: Where is this coming from?  
Answer: This issue came out of a case that involved lawyers on both sides. The scope and depth of being able to cheat commercially has become global and a huge undertaking. There are an incredible range of services available. The issue is not only use of a cell phone but it now involves clothing that has also become a way of cheating through

communications. This deviant economy is a significant integrity issue. Once we have identified the scope of the issue we will have a point from which we can then engage in some strategic planning to identify a way to deal with it.

- It was suggested that the committee members that have been serving on the Academic Discipline Committee have experience that should be shared with the rest of the faculty.
- Members were advised that the costs for the services are fairly steep. We do not know the extent to which SMU students are engaging in this activity. We have had legal counsel on this issue. These services don't necessarily come under Canadian fraud law. The student is defrauding the university in terms of academic integrity. There is an issue in extending that liability out to a third party. There is nothing fraudulent or criminal about selling an essay. There is argument that this enterprise could be considered entrepreneurial. There are some very interesting dynamics here in terms of ethics.
- Question: How do we become better equipped to deal with this?  
Answer: We need to know more before we can move forward with a mitigation strategy.
- Question: What was the fraud case in regard to? Answer: A student submitted a fraudulent test score.

There being no objection, the annual report of the Academic Discipline Committee was accepted into the Senate record.

c. 2014-2015 Annual Report, Senate Committee on Animal Care,  
*Appendix D* (C. Barber)

**Key discussion points:**

- The committee received positive feedback from the CCAC. Commendations to Dr Barber and Ms Yetman who have done an incredible amount go ensure this positive outcome.

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

d. 2014-2015 Annual Report, Senate Committee on Continuing Education,  
*Appendix E* (G. Michael)

**Key discussion points:**

- On Appendix A (the back page) are the programs, a list of the areas covered and what is being offered.
- Question: Please clarify the process followed when approving a course to become an on-line course. Is it the same process and rigor that is followed for a classroom course? Answer: We look at courses leading into programs and work with the various units and instructors in conjunction with the Deans and CAID.
- Question: What level of oversight do the departments and units have in terms of whether it is appropriate for a course to go one-line? Answer: When a course is approved to go on-line, one full-time faculty member takes responsibility for that course and a work plan is created. It is reviewed by the department chair and goes through the department review/curriculum process. The Dean reviews and signs

off on the course offering. There are also content experts that review the course offering before it goes on-line. It is reviewed for content as well as for best practices. These courses are subjected to a more rigorous process than regular courses.

- Question: Is there room for input at the department level as to whether it is appropriate for a course to go on-line? Answer: That falls under the responsibility of the department process.
- Members were advised that there is a committee on E-Learning that has been meeting over the last month or two. These concerns will be brought to that committee.
- Question: On-line course evaluations do not get the same response rate as those done in the classroom. Is there a strategy to deal with that? Answer: That will also be addressed.
- Question: The number of on-line credit courses have nearly doubled in the last couple of years. What about the academic integrity issues we discussed previously? What steps are being considered to ensure these courses are offered following a rigorous practice and that the issues of academic integrity are dealt with? Answer: Going forward we will have to review the process and our strategies. The departments will be involved in that discussion.
- A Senate member advised that they had been teaching on-line courses for a number of years and had seen nothing from Continuing Education in terms of directions regarding academic integrity.
- Members were advised that how exams are done for each course is entirely up to the instructor. It was suggested that every student could be given a different list of questions and individual invigilators could also be used.
- Whether a course is on-line or in-person, even if the methods are different, the problem is the same.
- Question: Are there any plans for approving additional credit certificates? Who delivers those? Answer: We work with the departments in terms of delivering them. We are working with the Department of Education and school boards on this issue.
- Question: Is this just for courses offered in the summer? Answer: No it is all year round. We are attempting to identify a need and supply a service. All programs will have to be approved by the Department of Education.

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

e. 2014-2015 Annual Report, Senate Committee on Literacy Strategy, *Appendix F* (R. Austin)

**Key discussion points:**

- The report includes the statement “With the dissolution of the CAID Office, .....” Senate members expressed surprise at this statement and asked for confirmation of the status of CAID. Dr Gauthier advised that this statement is incorrect. CAID is still fully functional and will remain that way into the future. There are some changes that are happening within the unit. Change the sentence to start with “With the changes in ~~dissolution~~ of the CAID Office, .....”

There being no objection, the annual report of the Literacy Strategy Committee was accepted into the Senate record as revised.

- f. Research Ethics Board (J. Cameron)
- i) 2014-2015 Annual Report, Research Ethics Board, *Appendix G*
- Key discussion points:**
- Question: Is there still a high pressure and high volume workload?  
Answer: Yes, but the work has been handled. There are administrative issues in the office due to workload but we are attempting to address those.
  - Question: The report mentions space concerns. What is the status of that? Answer: This is in regard to material and people. Atrium 211 is a fairly small space and it is pretty packed with files. There is also a steady stream of visitors and consultations with the research ethics officer. The space does not accommodate that activity comfortably. There may be some possibilities on this point. Members were advised that another space has been secured that will give twice the floor space of the current location. Arrangements should be in place by the end of the calendar year.

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

- ii) Revised Senate Policy on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans, *Appendix H*
- Key discussion points:**
- These revisions were based on comments/feedback from Senate.
  - The definition of research in this policy is “An undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a disciplined inquiry that is conducted with the expectation that the method, results, and conclusions will be able to withstand the scrutiny of the relevant research community”. When an instructor receives their student evaluations and tries to improve their teaching through use of that data, even though the results are not made public, they are submitted to the Dean. Question: What is the boundary in terms of this application? Answer: There is some ambiguity in this area but this use is clearly not research as defined in this policy. The evaluations are part of the institutional quality process and your use of them would reflect that purpose. If you used them for research, you would consider the data as data collected for another purpose.
  - Question: At what point does an issue not become an item for the REB? Clarity is needed to define at what point a faculty member needs to approach the REB.

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the revised policy is approved. Motion carried.**

- g. Updated 2015-2016 Membership of Senate Committees list, *Appendix I*  
**Key discussion points:**
- New student representative Collette Robert, VP of University Affairs was introduced.
- There being no objection the Membership of Senate Committees list was approved as circulated.

15026

**NEW BUSINESS FROM**

- a. Floor (not involving notice of motion)
- Discussion Topic: Test security breaches at the print shop.  
**Key discussion points:**
  - There was a request for the Vice President Academic & Research to provide Senate with the reason for the email about a new policy on tests and exams, that was circulated to faculty from his office, and to advise regarding to what extent this policy was dealing with the issues.
  - There have been cases involving cheating on exams using various forms of technology to facilitate that cheating. An investigation was carried out and concerns were identified regarding how students were gaining access to exams prior to the exam date. The university is in no way implying anyone has been shown to be culpable.
  - The print shop receives, copies and return exams. There has been evidence of gaps in the protocols. The university contracts Ricoh to manage the print shop. Ricoh is responsible for hiring and supervising their employees. They did an internal investigation and arrived at some conclusions. The university received a copy of that report.
  - The current policy on printing was created in 1993 and was last revised in 2007. It states that exams will be delivered by hand to the print centre five days prior to the deadline requirement. The department secretary is supposed to pick up the copies, confirm the content, and a signature is required on pick-up.
  - In Halifax, there is at least one external company offering services to provide answers to university exams. In a number of the cases that were being examined it became apparent that these instances were more than isolated. It appears that there are a number of individuals diligently working to gain access to this type of information.
  - One of the approaches is for Ricoh to tighten their procedures. Ricoh's concern was that if they tighten their procedures and the issues continue, who would be responsible for that. It takes seconds to take a picture but then everyone in the chain become culpable. The institution needs to make sure we have our protocols in place and find ways to address the problem.
  - The revised process is that the Print Centre can only accept tests or exams in hard copy. TA's are allowed to drop off tests to the Print Centre for copying, but they are NOT allowed to pick up the copies. Tests/exams must be picked up from the Print Centre by faculty or staff. Test security breaches pertain to academic integrity issues.

- One department expressed concern about the print shop not being open in the evening. The Fred Smithers Centre expressed concern about the impact on their ability to administer exams. We have convened a committee, with representation from all faculties, to look at this. The first meeting is the week of November 23. They are charged to propose a viable protocol that might work at SMU. That will be used to update the existing policy.
- It was suggested that the current policy is triggering current faculty (part-time and/or full-time) to have their teaching assistants copy tests and exams in the department. Tests have been left on the photocopier. The site management in the print shop confirmed that copying decreased at the print shop in October. This behavior may increase the risk. The policy while having good intentions may be detrimental.
- On a regular basis we send emails with attachments containing fairly sensitive information. Hard copy versus email seems to be an issue for faculty.
- Everyone that gets involved in this situation feels tainted. The integrity of the process must be addressed.
- Question: Is there a way to differentiate between a test and an exam? Would the policy only pertain to exams? Answer: This particular policy is pertaining to both tests and exams.
- The new policy represents a huge new and different challenge to the system, especially for the part-time instructors. A ban on emailing these documents is not going to practically address the issue.
- This is a wider and more serious practice that was at first expected. Any guidance from the faculty and/or Senators would be greatly appreciated. A strategy must be identified.
- Question: How secure are the SMUport Groups? Is it possible that instructors could place their exams on a secure site and only the authorized individual would have access to that? Answer: If there were a secure process and protocol it would be fine. The issue is when people step outside of the protocol. We need to find a way to limit or eliminate this behaviour.
- Question: Do we know exactly how it happened, or just that it happened? Answer: In a couple of cases we know exactly what happened, but in other situations we do not. This is one of the reasons we asked Ricoh to initiate investigation. We have an internal assessment report, and they are addressing the gaps that were identified. The other area is the transfers within the departments. We are trying to find a way to address that situation.
- Concern was expressed on Bullet 3 – “In the short term, exams must be submitted in person (either hard or soft copy acceptable) the Print Shop will not accept exams by email or other unsecured electronic process.” Members were concerned about email being considered as an unsecured process. Answer: All concerns are legitimate.

- Question: A student advised that they heard the Forensic Program had been cancelled. The Dean of Science was asked to respond. Answer: Only Senate can cancel or suspend a program. There has been no submission to the Academic Planning Committee or Senate to cancel or suspend the FRSC Program. In a situation where a program is terminated, any student enrolled in it at the university will be able to complete their program.
- The program committee recommended a temporary restriction on admissions to this program for the fall. At this time, no such recommendation has come forward to Academic Planning or Senate.
- All but one member of the Forensic program Executive (including the program coordinator) has resigned. Response: The Dean is addressing this situation.

15027

### **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

#### Key Points:

- Attended a Universities Canada membership meeting in Ottawa last week. First Nations education governance and research was a meeting focus. The tone in Ottawa was totally different. The then Prime Minister-Elect, Justin Trudeau, attended the dinner event and attendees were provided the opportunity to hear first-hand his thinking on a wide array of subjects, most notably post-secondary initiatives. We were told that there was already draft of the long form census.
- A Provincial Transition Task Force, chaired by Deputy Minister Duff Montgomerie, is making good initial progress looking at the `transitions` from primary to postsecondary.
- Met with Minister Counsellor (Education) Madam Yang Xinyu. We discussed new opportunities for student mobility between China and Canada.
- There is a draft of an MOU between the NS universities and the government. It has been discussed and feedback has been provided by the institutions. The document also refers to innovation activities that are currently underway.
- Saint Mary`s has publicized the market adjustment for tuitions. We have been praised for the consultative manner by which we undertook that process.
- There have been a number of successful alumni events in recent weeks. The President was in Sidney on Tuesday at one such event. There was a large turnout. There are alumni events in Calgary, Edmonton and Toronto in the coming weeks.
- There has been strong interest from perspective students and we are hopeful that will translate into enrolments.
- Yesterday morning the President attended an event highlighting global internationalization. One speaker was a SMU Student from China who spoke on their experience. This student works with Irving Oil and is a perfect example of connecting students around the globe with corporate experience/opportunities.
- Yesterday morning the Royal Canadian Mint released a coin that celebrated the Saint Mary`s observatory and the telescope.



- At 2 pm this afternoon, Saint Mary`s released the coach and assistant coach of the Huskies football team. An acting coach has been secured and we will start a search for a new coach.
- Next steps on strategic planning process are underway.

**15028**

**QUESTION PERIOD**

- Question: Can you provide Senate members with background on why the coach and assistant coach were released? Answer: Details are not available for release. This is not an attempt to destroy reputations but an acknowledgement of the challenges the team has to face and the desire for a new strategy for next year.

**15029**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:11 P.M.

Barb Bell,  
Secretary to the Office of Senate