SENATE MEETING MINUTES
February 12, 2016

The 572nd Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, February 12, 2016 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 Vessey, Dr Naulls, Dr Austin, Dr Bjornson, Dr Campbell, Dr Conrad, Dr Gilin-Oore, Dr Grandy, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Henry, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr VanderPlaat, Ms DeYoung, Mr Hotchkiss, Ms Robert, Dr Sarty (for Dr Smith), Mr Sisk, Ms Murphy, Mr Rajnis, Mr Beckett, Ms Morrison and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr Bradshaw, Dr Smith, Dr Kozloski, Dr Hlongwane, Dr Peckmann, Mr Michael, Mr Algermozi, Mr Armony, Mr Rakotandrafara, and Mr Rice,

Meeting commenced at 2:30 P.M.

15048	**REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**

15048   **REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**
The report was accepted as circulated.
Mr. Landry Rakotandrafara is replacing Ms Bhayani who is experiencing schedule conflicts this term. This is the first meeting for two new Senators elected in the by-election. Dr Eric Henry and Dr Karen Grandy.

15049   **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
Minutes of the meeting of January 15, 2016, were *circulated* as *Appendix A*.
Moved by Vessey and seconded, **"that the minutes of the meeting of January 15, 2016 are approved as circulated."** **Motion carried.**

15050   **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTE**
   .01   Saint Mary's University Web Steering Committee response to the recommendations of the Senate Sub-Committee on the University Website report. Dec 12 - sub-committee recommendations, *Appendix B*.
Key discussion points:
➢ A report was circulated at the meeting in response to the recommendations of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee.

- ➤ The recommendations were grouped into three areas – 1) Understanding roles, responsibilities & training, 2) Ownership evolution: Program pages and Departmental pages, and 3) SMUCV: Faculty 180 as a Pan University Solution. We have started initial discussions with communications officers and CAID. We are also assessing the impact of the TerminalFour version 8 upgrade.
- ➤ Under the first of these themes: Understanding Roles, Responsibilities and Training the actions will be as follows:
  - o to develop a glossary of terms so that everyone understands what is being discussed.
  - o At initial conversion to the new website, the owners of the various areas were identified. This information and the contacts will be updated. Those identified will be contacted to ensure they are aware of their responsibility.
  - o We need to evaluate the resources we have for training. We know there is a need for updated documentation.
  - o We are working on a document site with an area for frequently asked questions (FAQ).
  - o The upgrade of TerminalFour to Version 8 will provide additional functionality for the site. CAID is our training resource for faculty and staff. Training will be necessary to deal with this upgrade.
  - o Question: What is TerminalFour? Answer: TerminalFour is the software that allows management of the content on our website. This software has a hierarchical structure.
  - o Question: There are a lot of changes happening in CAID. Will CAID remain the training centre? Answer: Training faculty and staff is the mandate of CAID. Dr Gauthier advised members that CAID's mandate is NOT changing.
- ➤ Under the second theme: Ownership evolution: Program pages and Departmental pages, the actions will be as follows:
  - o The website has to serve many purposes and audiences to meet university requirements (recruitment, both undergrad and graduate, research and community outreach).
  - o We have identified navigation inconsistencies across departments and faculties. We need to consult with the community to resolve this. No matter where the contact is coming from or what they are looking for, the site has to be designed to satisfy all communities. The program pages need to be retained to address this. What is missing is the graduate recruitment component and the outreach components.
  - o Work is being done on an on-line academic calendar. A lot of the program pages could be linked to that academic calendar which would eliminate the necessity for duplicating course description information, or department faculty lists.
  - o When Success Maps comes on stream it will help with some of the information that has been residing on these pages.
  - o Question: A Senator just searched Biology courses and the result was the old program that hasn't been taught for several years. Is something going to be done about that? Answer: Some of this will be addressed with the academic calendar initiation. The Senator was advised to contact the ITSS group to get it corrected on the website. Rajnis advised to direct all requests to the help desk for resolution. They will know the appropriate individual to assign to the task.

- The Associate Dean of Science advised that the Faculty of Science gave notice of some issues that needed to be changed but after several months nothing has happened. Response: Information on courses and programs has to be linked to the most current version of the academic calendar and this will be available shortly.
- Question: How are the issues around ownership going to evolve? Faculty strongly feel that one page for a department/program is essential to avoid confusion. We believe the two page system to be essentially flawed. Answer: The program pages predate the website redesign. Outside searches were experiencing issues finding programs because they needed to drill down through many levels within the website to find them. The route that had to be taken was through the Faculty and Department/Program which required knowledge of our administrative structure. The general public would not have this foreknowledge to be able to find what they were looking for. The navigation to the departments was developed with consultation with the Dean. All of the Faculties have a slightly different navigation process. We also have programs for which there is no one department (cross-disciplinary). We also need a process to address those programs. Within the next couple of months we should have the content of the new on-line calendar done and that will address some of these issues.
- Question: If we have data that states that the students just use google, should we not address that? Answer: The approach varies with the individual. We have to be able to satisfy all types of searches. We want our pages to have priority listing for as many of those types of searches as possible. There is very different information on the department pages and little consistency in content and quality. The intent was that the program pages represent a consistent format and presentation and provide program information necessary to answer the inquiry. If we go back to a single Program/Department page, we will have some Departments that will do a good job of their website content and we will have other Departments that will do a terrible job of it.
- The major issue faculty have with the two page situation is when errors are identified and they are not addressed for months. The information must be kept current and correct.
- Senators were advised that it is only the first introductory program page that remains static. The recruitment folks met with all the proponents before those pages were refreshed so the information should have been current at that point.
- Members were advised that Departments can edit their own content. People may not understand that they can change the content. The Dean has ownership of the site but it can be delegated down to the Department. This may vary across the faculty. We will need to consult on this with the Deans.
- Each department has someone who can update department pages. The communications officers have total access to make updates to any page within the Faculty. ITSS and Public Affairs can update the program pages. ITSS is working very close with the Communications Officers to see that this gets done.
- It was noted that the lack of communication is a serious issue.
- ➢ Under the third theme: SMUCV: Faculty 180 as a Pan University Solution – the actions will be as follows

- o When we selected Faculty 180, the goal was to have a well formatted product. The product that was selected does not do that well and it will be replaced.
- o In terms of communication we need to improve that link with the stakeholders.
- o Question: Is the intention to have a way for each faculty member to be able to update the information on their faculty page other than through SMUCV? (A member advised that they had tried to update the information for two years unsuccessfully.) Is there somewhere to get help with this? Answer: SMUCV gives a standard profile but there are links to pages that you can update yourself. Action Item: Rajnis will contact you to assist with information on how to do this.
- o Question: When SMUCV was implemented, weren't the personal pages deleted? Faculty received a message to that affect. Answer: Members were advised that Husky One is still available but ITSS has also set up another server where those types of pages can be hosted. Everyone was emailed about how to access that but we cannot promise all kinds of support for that site. We are trying to encourage faculty to use SMUCV.
- ➢ Question: We were told that CAID had the mandate for web training but we have also been told to go to the help desk or to Rajnis for help. Where do we go? Answer: Technical issues are handled through Rajnis. Other training is through CAID. If you contact the help desk you will be directed to the appropriate area/individual for assistance.
- ➢ Question: Is it possible for the Senate to ask for additional reports in the coming months to report on progress? Answer: Yes. A follow-up report will be scheduled for April.
- ➢ Question: Do we get a personal page? Answer: We do provide space but the support for that is minimal. There are no templates Available for use.

.02 Update on the status of the Diploma in Forensic Science (Dean Smith), support documents requested by Senate members posted as *Appendices C1, C2, C3 & C4*

Key discussion points:
- ➢ Question: The report of the external reviewers is dated March 11, 2013. The reviewers concluded that the current Diploma program was at key crossroads that will result in either the inevitable decline of the program or immediate expansion into a designated Major in Forensic Science, with a possible supporting Diploma for practitioners. In that report it is stated that there was support at all levels, e.g. SMU faculty, medical examiner, students, recruiting, to see this transition from diploma to degree happen. Where are we at in terms of the program and that recommendation? Answer: The Program, Dean, APC and Senate all responded to those recommendations. All of the recommendations were addressed. As of the end of the 2014-2015 academic year there was an action plan that was then initiated at the beginning of the 2015-2016 academic year. In December 2015 progress on the Action Plan stopped and the coordinator resigned. We have new representatives looking at this situation. They are reviewing the situation with the goal of finding a way forward for this program.

We believe we can make progress but perhaps not in the direction that was initially identified and started.

➤ Question: Is the program admitting new students? Answer: The mandate from Senate was to take care of the students in the program. The program that we are continuing to offer is the existing program.

➤ Question: How many students are there in the program? Answer: There are approximately 30 students in the program and the cap for new admissions is 20. We are restricting admissions to students already registered at SMU. If a student is a graduate of SMU, they will be allowed to come back to pursue further FRSC studies.

➤ Question: Does the on-line initiative still exist? Answer: We are not pursuing it at this point. It would take a large resource investment to do it right and the students were very vocal that they did not want the on-line components.

➤ Question: Who is coordinating the program? Answer: Sarty was appointed by the Dean as the acting coordinator of the program until September when Tim Fraser will come back from sabbatical and take over as Program Coordinator.

➤ Question: What is the intention in terms of next steps? Answer: We will offer a program that introduces students to Forensics. We cannot offer the higher level program and therefore we are focusing on doing what we did well. We may offer this as a certificate program versus a diploma. We will also have the assistance of the Associate Dean of Curriculum in terms of curriculum structure and potential revisions.

➤ Question: Will this happen before the next review is scheduled? Answer: We will be responding to the recommendations from last review for a while yet and have not considered a future review at this time.

➤ Question: Given the requirement in the Collective Agreement 13.1.61(f) that stipulates that a program coordinator must call a meeting of the teaching faculty in the program every term, will that be done in the near future? Answer: This is a small program and we are doing this simultaneously within the review process.

➤ Question: Is the plan is to continue with the diploma on campus without a web based component? Answer: Yes.

➤ Question: Who is making these decisions? Answers: The mandate has been given to the Dean and the Associate Dean was delegated to do this. He is currently meeting with all faculty involved in the program.

➤ Question: How does reducing the program from three streams to one impact our MPHEC approval? Answer: The streams address different populations of students and do not affect program content. We have done this in other programs so there is a precedent for this approach.

15051   **REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES**
     .01   **Academic Planning Committee**
        i) Biology one-year follow-up report subsequent to their program review, *Appendix D1 & D2*
        Key discussion points:

- ➢ Question: Why was the pre-health stream dropped? Answer: Our faculty experience did not match with the course content requirements.
- ➢ A student advised there was concern regarding course selections for students in the medical stream. Answer: The courses that were required for entrance to medical school have been retained. Biology courses are not required to be accepted into medical school.
- ➢ Question: Is there an anatomy or physiology requirement? Do we have such a course? Answer: We have created a physiology and a comparative anatomy course to address those requirements.
- ➢ Faculty advising have worked with students in terms of post-graduate paths. We have also worked closely with Dalhousie in terms of whether our courses satisfy their requirements. Our current anatomy course does not meet the requirements but we are working to make the changes that are needed.

There being no objection, the Senate accepted into the record the Biology Program's one-year follow-up report as meeting the requirements of Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Undergraduate Programs at Saint Mary's."

ii) Formation of a Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Service and Experiential Learning. Notice of Motion attached as *Appendix E*
   Key discussion points:
   - ➢ This is a follow-up from earlier Senate discussions. APC was asked to discuss this topic and they have provided three motions.

   Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **"that the Senate approves the following membership for the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Service and Experiential Learning.**
   Dr Enns (Chair) (Representing CAID and the Provincial Working Committee),
   Mr Algermozi (SMUSA);
   Dr Crocker (ARTS/FGSR);
   Dr Dong (Science);
   Dr Bateman (SSB);
   Mr Sanderson (BDC); and
   Mr Jeffrey (Student Services)."
   Motion carried.
   <<Note: 4 May, 2016 – Dr T. O'Malley added to group>>
   and

   Moved by Gauthier and seconded, **"that the Senate approves the following initial terms of reference (TOR) with the understanding that the Ad Hoc Committee will consider enhancement of these terms during their initial meetings.**

   1. **define the term "service-learning" and "experiential-learning" within the Saint Mary's context;**

2. **identify and prepare a report on active and experiential learning opportunities that currently exist for all SMU students; and**
3. **suggest recommendations on how to better implement and expand such opportunities at the university."**
Motion carried.

and

Moved by and seconded, **"that the Ad Hoc Committee submit a progress report at the April 8th, 2016 Senate meeting." Motion carried.**

.02 **Curriculum Committee Report,** *Appendix F*
Key discussion points:
➢ No discussion.
Moved by Dixon, and seconded, **"that the Senate approves the curriculum addendum report as circulated/revised for publication in the 2016-2017 Academic Calendar." Motion carried.**

15052 **NEW BUSINESS FROM**
a. Floor (not involving notice of motion)
Question: (Arising from the discussions during the last meeting) A member shared their concern regarding the lack of communication between the Board of Governors and the Senate. Board financial decisions impact Academic Programs. This concern was express in regard to the upcoming Board of Governors retreat. It was suggested that Senate should be included in those discussions. At the retreat the Board will be discussing issues that will impact academic matters. Can the Senate have a rep at that retreat? Answer: Ours is a bicameral system, with the governing body defined as the Board of Governors, and Senate defined as the academic authority. The Act articulates a clear distinction between the Board and Senate and their responsibilities. The Board has the mandate for fiduciary matters and does not report back to the Senate in that regard. We have run three table top discussions, a town hall with faculty and staff and one with the students. The retreat is just the next step in this process. Discussions will include value and values, financial sustainability, and the issues that have been covered in the previous initiatives. Members were advised that the issues that are being discussed by the Board during the retreat will be brought back to the Senate. Members were reminded that there are six faculty members that serve on the Board.

15053 **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
Key Points:
The President advised the following:
➢ We continue the work of MOU finalization with the provincial government. There is a continued commitment going forward for the

1% increase. The University Presidents are moving a block grant approach. The new formula is going to be more flexible. This recent initiative represents an attempt for a stronger transparency and responsibility between the province and the universities. The Universities are being asked for greater accountability measures.

➢ SMU is nowhere near to needing to call on Bill 100. This is due to our financial stability. We are increasingly less dependent on the government and much more dependent on tuition. We are also working on increasing the fundraising and philanthropy revenue streams.

➢ President's compensation was discussed and no one was opposed to posting information on compensation for university presidents. There has been concern expressed in regard to the compensation for Past Presidents.

➢ The process also includes new working groups on some of the self-identified groups within university populations. We can build on the approaches we have already in terms of accessibility. It also included a codification of all the working groups reflected within the universities. This looks at the way academic programing translates into careers. In this regard, we are advocating for a long-term view of education within the province.

➢ Good progress is being made with the consulting firm engaged to examine/advise on our fundraising portfolio.

➢ Vena, our new budgeting/financial reporting system, was successfully launched in January. We anticipate greater tracking and forecasting capabilities.

15054   **QUESTION PERIOD**

➢ Question: In the discussions that go on with the Province or the University Presidents has there been any consideration of the level of support we enjoy from the province relative to the accountability they are requiring from us? Members were advised of the Wikipedia definition of a Public University <<A public university is a university that is predominantly funded by public means through a national or subnational government, as opposed to private universities.>> At some point the government should be made aware that universities in Nova Scotia may not qualify, under this definition, as public. It was suggested that at some point we need to push back. Answer: This is interesting. The ministers commented that they provide the largest amount of funding. If we look at that within our university, we are below 40%. We have pushed back at the deputy minister level on this.

➢ We need to be thoughtful in terms of our program development and also our fundraising activities. We are not going to see a substantial change in the 1% increase approach by the provincial government. There are other sources of government funding and we need to be

creative in terms of applying for things like graduate funding. It is important that we move into a different financial model.
➢ We are working towards a very careful expansion of funding coming from external donors that will address some of these concerns. In the next few months we will see the impact of the tuition increases but we have to be sensitive to the issues of access and accessibility. We also need to be thoughtful about the adjustment to the funding formula.
➢ Members were advised that this conversation with government goes on eternally. The environment is a continuing changing one. We have a legislative act that gives us our power and we do remind government about that. We will continue to work with our colleagues to advance education within our province. There is not likely to be any fundamental shifts to the mandates of the universities in this province.
➢ A student advised that there will be a meeting of students and government representatives at which it is the intention of our student representative to ask for more funding for Saint Mary's.
➢ Members were advised that there are few universities that have the level of engagement with the government that Maritime Universities have. We have a great opportunity to push forward agenda items that are particularly important to us. The universities can make good use of other government funding programs because of our level of engagement. Senators were encouraged to talk to colleagues across the country and they will find that those colleagues do not have as good a situation.
➢ Question: Canadian Martyrs Church may be sold. Do we have a plan for this? Answer: They have expressed an interest in selling that property. We do not have right of first refusal. We have expressed our interest and are reviewing our options. It is the very early stages in this negotiation process.
➢ Members were advised that the annual international event night held last night was very successful. This event kicks off global awareness month. There are a number of events scheduled during the month. Faculty will be presenting on their research at these events.
➢ Question: Is there a schedule on-line? Answer: There is a schedule on the website.

15055   **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting adjourned at 4:25 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary to the Office of Senate