



One University. One World. Yours.

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

## SENATE MEETING MINUTES September 21, 2018

The 594<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, September 21, 2018, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr VanderPlaat, Chairperson, presided.

**PRESENT:** Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr Butler, Dr Smith, Dr Bhabra, Dr MacDonald, Dr Doucet, Dr Francis, Dr Grandy, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Hall, Dr Kehoe, Dr Khokar, Dr Loughlin, Dr McCallum, Dr Power, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr VanderPlaat, Dr Warner, Mr Brophy, Ms van den Hoogen, Mr Nasrallah, Mr Mahmudur Rahman Shovon, Mr Southwell, Ms Witter, Ms Sargeant Greenwood, Dr Irving (MATH), Dr Muir (and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate).

**REGRETS:** Dr Sarty, Dr Rahaman and Mr Archibald

Meeting commenced at 2:32 P.M.

The new members of Senate were introduced and welcomed.

### **18001 ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSON, SECRETARY AND PARLIAMENTARIAN**

#### **.01 Nominations for Chair of Senate:**

Moved by McCallum, and seconded, **'that Dr Madine Vanderplaat is re-elected as Chairperson for the 2018-2019 Senate year.'** Motion carried.

#### **.02 Nominations for Vice-Chair of Senate:**

Moved by Stinson, and seconded, **'that Dr. Takseva is re-elected as Vice-Chairperson for the 2018-2019 Senate year.'** Motion carried.

#### **.03 Nominations for Secretary of Senate:**

Moved by Doucet, and seconded, **'that Barb Bell is re-elected as Secretary of Senate for the 2018-2019 Senate year.'** Motion carried.

#### **.04 Nominations for Parliamentarian:**

Moved by Smith, and seconded, **'that Dr Doucet is re-elected as Parliamentarian for the 2018-2019 Senate year.'** Motion carried.

18002

**REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**

**Key Discussion Points:**

- There was a request to reorder item five - Business Arising - items 1 and 2 to be addressed in the reverse order.
- Members were advised that Dr Irving is attending to respond to questions on the MATH review but must leave for another commitment at 3:30 pm. It may be necessary to address that item earlier in the agenda.
- The report of the Agenda Committee was accepted as revised.

18003

**MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Minutes of the meeting of May 11, 2018, were *circulated* as **Appendix A**.

Moved by Grek Martin, and seconded, **“that the minutes of the meeting of May 11, 2018 are approved as circulated.” Motion carried.**

18004

**BUSINESS ARISING**

1. Academic Regulations Committee – report on process to create Academic Calendar of Events, **Appendix C** and **Appendix D 1 – 10**. (Dr Smith)

**Key Discussion Points:**

- During the previous academic year, SMUSA requested a review of the criteria used to create the Academic Calendar of Events. SMUSA’s several requests have been integrated into the proposal before Senate today.
- The committee reviewed the criteria used to create that Academic Calendar of Events. One significant item in this proposal that differs from current practice is that in order to incorporate SMUSA’s request for a one-week fall break, it is necessary to schedule exams on Sunday. We are also proposing to schedule exams on Patron Feast Day.
- Question: It was noted that there is still a discrepancy in the number of teaching days between the fall/winter terms and the summer term. Why is this? Answer: There are 24 Mon/Wed and Tues/Thurs classes. It was suggested to include the words “or equivalent”. The intent is that there are 12 weeks of classes with classes scheduled twice a week. A week equals three hours of classes (12 x 3) for a total of 36 teaching hours. Eleven (11) teaching days equals 33 teaching hours in summer terms. It was suggested to increase this to 12 teaching days or 36 teaching hours in the summer months.
- Question; What about the one day per week classes? They do not meet 24 times. If those classes meet on a Monday only, they have the potential to meet less than that. They have the potential to lose one or two teaching days. It was suggested that we just specify 36 teaching hours. Answer: We accommodate for holiday Mondays by extending the teaching term by one more Monday teaching day. It was suggested that the very last day of term could be stipulated as a Monday to cover this situation.
- It was noted that this criteria is meant for undergraduate programs.
- Question: The add / drop period is quite a bit shorter than previously. It was seven working days and now it is five working days. Why? Answer: Students who are essentially starting a course in the third week of classes are at a disadvantage.
- Question: Will this make it easier for students to get into classes that are already full? Answer: This revision will not change that.
- The Director of Student Services expressed concern that classes started on a Monday and in one case on a Tuesday. This poses a problem for them.

**Action Item: Bell** to check all 10 calendars for start dates in January and time prior to the start date for Student Services purposes. NOTE: This was done after the meeting. A two – four working day gap exists in all 10 calendars prior to the start of classes. In no year did classes start on a Tuesday. **Action Item: Brophy and Smith** will discuss a solution.

- The SMUSA representatives requested that a criterion be added to stipulate that the length of the break in the fall and winter terms is one-week long.
- Question: Why is the fall break so late in the term? Should it be earlier?  
Answer: We are coordinating with the fall breaks scheduled by other universities.

Moved by Smith and seconded, “that Senate approve the criteria submitted as Appendix C with revisions as discussed.” Motion carried.

2. Academic Regulations Committee – report on Academic Regulations review, *Appendix B1* – Notice of Motion, *Appendix B2* – Revised Academic Regulations. (Dr Smith)

**Key Discussion Points:**

- The committee was tasked with doing a review of the Academic Regulations to identify any ambiguity and ensure they would facilitate (as much as was possible) student success.

Moved by Smith and seconded, “that the Senate approve an omnibus motion to approve the revisions to the academic regulations as submitted in Appendix B2.” This motion was withdrawn subsequent to the discussion below. Item forwarded to the October Senate Agenda.

- Revision to **Academic Regulation #4 Grading System** to articulate that faculty must have provided feedback equal to 15% of a students’ grade prior to 50% of the scheduled classes being completed.
  - A Senator suggested that this restricts the academic freedom of faculty to set up their course the way they wish. This states that the evaluation has to be done before the students have had time to absorb the material being taught.
  - The current regulations states: Instructors must also provide feedback to students regarding their progress in the course prior to the final date by which a student may cancel the course without academic penalty (see Academic Regulation 16 a). Normally, for undergraduate courses, this feedback must equal a minimum of 15% of the final grade. This tends to be a date in November (7-15). Students had an issue with this because they did not have the time to make an informed decision on their position in their course. The 50% deadline added so that we did not tie this requirement to a specific day. Students should have feedback and this revision to the regulation does not specify how we do this. It is a reasonable request if we are to put students first. It was acknowledged that this might influence the way faculty handles evaluations and teaching in their courses.
  - Question: Is there a way to split the difference? Is there a compromise that might be more amenable to faculty? We are moving the date about a month earlier.
  - The student representatives spoke in support of the 50% deadline.

- Members were advised that there are some business courses with group work. Those courses will struggle with this requirement.
  - Question: Are there a number of student complaints related to this issue? Answer: This request was based on the issues that students have experienced. This is particularly important for first year students who are also struggling with transitioning to university. With this revision, students would have enough time to access the services that we provide to help them.
  - Question: How do we implement this when there is only one evaluation done in a course? Answer: That may not be the best practice to follow.
  - Comment: Often the students having the most difficulty are the ones that do not know how they are doing. It is often the unskilled that are unable to assess their level of achievement in a course. This can be particularly valid in graduate programs.
  - As a compromise, if we were to move this deadline to one week past the midterm that would be equal to about 57.5 % of the course being complete.
  - Further discussion on this motion was tabled in order to address the MATH program review.
- Revision to Academic Regulation #6 Grade Point Average, b and e.
    - Question: Is it only the second grade that is taken (which may be the lowest grade) - unless it is an F and then it is ignored? This is ambiguous. Answer: This has been the practice.
    - The Acting Registrar advised that if we were to use the highest grade, this would encourage students to retake courses (potentially multiple times) in an attempt to improve their grade. We do not want to encourage such a practice.
    - Question: Will both grades show up on the transcript? Answer: Yes but only the most recent grade is included in the calculation of the DGPA.
    - Members were advised that other universities approach this differently and perhaps this should be reviewed.
    - Question: It was suggested that the highest grade should be taken. Can we consider doing that? Answer: There needs to be some consequence for taking the course a second time. There is always a risk the student will not improve. Students should not be motivated to take courses repetitively in the hope of improving their grade.
- Revision to Academic Regulation #7 Standing Required, c Good Standing, d Academic Probationary Status d, e Eligibility to Continue, f, Required Academic Counseling, g Suspension and h Dismissal.
    - Members were advised that there was a discrepancy in the calendar regarding what constituted good standing and the standing required to graduate (1.7 versus 2.0). We are correcting that in this regulation.
    - There are also revisions to the assessment reviews for probation and to the length of suspension to reduce it to one academic term. We are proposing that any student with a CGPA lower than 2.0 will be placed on probation. The first assessment of risk will be done in January. Students would be contacted and a discussion had with advisors. Available services would be initiated to assist students to remediate this situation. There will also be a set of expectations to be met during this period. If

students are suspended, it is only for one term and there will now be an appeal process.

- It says CGPA – should that be annual GPA? Answer: No.
- Question: A SMUSA representative asked if we are able to get numbers from last year for how many students were affected by this situation? Answer: The Acting Registrar responded that we know that by moving the level to 2.0 it would double the number of students on probation. This process would identify students that need support. When the Regulations Sub-Committee looked at this revision to the regulations, the Academic Advisors and Associate Deans were asked to participate in those discussions.
- A SMUSA Representative suggested that Saint Mary's needs a course similar to the one that Dalhousie offers in the summer session for those at risk of being suspended. If the students get 75-80 percent in this course, they can return to their studies in the fall term.
- Concern was expressed regarding this revision. Faculty asked for more time to understand this issue.
- Question: Is it possible to defer this item until the next Senate meeting? Answer: It was noted that the committee engaged in consultations with various stakeholders around campus when considering revisions to this regulation. Significant discussion and consultation was done which resulted in this submission.
- Question: The Senior Director, Student Affairs asked if the Athletics Director was consulted because this revision may negatively affect athletes. Answer: The Acting Registrar stated there was not consultation with the Athletics Director, but that this applies to all students.
- The Acting Registrar advised that a section providing an appeal process was added in the regulation. Every faculty does an ad-hoc version of this. This is to formalize the process. Students advised that they do not have any participation in this process. They feel this should not reside in the individual faculties but should be handled by a Senate Committee. Response: The Registrar advised that the committee felt that these appeals were better handled at the faculty level and not the Senate level. The Committee felt that it did not make sense to create additional work for the Senate Academic Appeals Committee. In terms of student representation, there are serious concerns about medical and personal information discussed at this level of appeals. The students responded that this information was discussed at the Academic Appeals Committee, the Academic Discipline Committees and the Student Discipline Committees as well. They suggested that if they were present at those discussions, they should be able to be present at this level.
- Question: A Senator stated that when this revision takes effect, we will have double the number of students to deal with. Do we currently have the resources to do that? Answer: The Acting Registrar responded that the numbers are small and we have the resources to manage the demand.
- The Acting Registrar stated that there could be students that opted not to appeal because of an absence of a process. Once a process is created, there may be more submissions.
- A Senator suggested that students who are struggling are the most likely to leave. The Acting Registrar responded that the university will be contacting those students a full semester ahead of the current practice. At that point, there is time to parachute help in for them.

- Question: A Senator asked if there are caseworkers assigned to the students? Answer: The Acting Registrar responded that we have two caseworkers for this purpose.
- Further discussion was deferred to the October Senate meeting.
- Revision to Academic Regulations #8. Examinations
  - The first revision is to address the issue that course related activities have been required on designated study days. This stops that practice.
  - In section d, A Senator advised that it should say that faculty have input. Faculty do not know they can make special requests in this regard. Response: Members were advised that this is a department issue but this concern will be taken under advisement.
  - Take home exams are being addressed in this regulation. Take home exams have been distributed before the end of classes and students are doing significant work on these prior to the end of classes, which is not consistent with the regulations.
  - Question: What about courses that do not have exams? Does this require assigning the last class date as the due date for the final paper? Answer: Yes. If there were a desire to have something like a paper due within the exam period, it would be treated as a take home exam. It was noted that if a student needed an extension that would be an exception to the rules.
  - A Senator commented that a take home exam and an essay are different. We do not want to overload the student with a take home exam when they are supposed to be preparing for exams. A paper treated like a take home exam would not be able to be circulated until the last day of class. This would cause the student an issue because of the time needed to complete a major paper.
- Revision to Academic Regulation #9 Evaluations – change heading to Final Grade.
  - No discussion.
- Revisions to Academic Regulation 11 Academic Appeals – b Other Appeals – to articulate examples of other appeals.
  - No discussion.
- Revisions to Academic Regulation 13 Course Changes – to decouple the add and drop dates and make them sooner in the academic year.
  - Question: What does the reference to “a full semester” in 13 d mean? Answer: It was suggested that the words “fall and winter terms” will replace “a full semester” consistent with references elsewhere in the regulations. This was acceptable to the assembly.
- Revisions to Academic Regulation 17 Retaking a Course.
  - Academic Regulation 6 b states the most recent pass grade is included. Academic Regulation 17 a states “recent grade” when it should state “recent pass grade”. Remove ‘even if this is a lower grade’, from the end of this sentence.
- Revisions to Academic Regulation 18 Withdrawal for Academic Reasons
  - No discussion
- Revisions to Academic Regulation 20 Advanced Standing

- No discussion
- Revisions to Academic Regulation 21 Transfer Credit Hours – to articulate that a LOP form must be submitted prior to the start of classes.
  - No discussion
- Revisions to Academic Regulation 24 Requirements of Two Academic Programs (Dual Program) Baccalaureate Degrees
  - No discussion
- Revisions to Academic Regulation 27 Convocation, Dates, Degrees, Diplomas, and Certificates.
  - Correct the spelling in the first reference to Service Centre.
  - Question: Who has been in oversight when it comes to appropriate academic regalia? Answer: Heather Harroun has been doing this. A request has been submitted for a process to be developed.
  - Question: Do you have to say exceptions will be made? Is there a definition for ‘appropriate attire’? The following revision was suggested: Exceptions to the academic attire may be granted for culturally appropriate reasons.
- Revisions to Academic Regulation #31 Dean’s Lists for Undergraduate Programs.
  - No discussion.

**Dr Smith withdrew the motion. Item deferred to October Senate meeting.**

**3.** Update on the Cross-Faculty Working Group on Academic Literacy & First Year Learning. (Dr Butler)

**Key Discussion Points:**

- We had agreement between the CASE Committee and this sub-committee that our approach needed to have a blend of curricular and Co-Curricular elements. A small pilot was initiated over the summer. Some faculty members are participating in a community of practice related to the Co-Curricular components of this initiative. Consultant and TA support is provided to these faculty members.
- In the interests of time, further discussion is deferred to the October Senate meeting.

**4.** Update – President’s Ad-hoc Committee on Racism on Campus, *Appendix X* (President)

**Key Discussion Points:**

- This is a Presidential Committee and not a Senate Committee. The six-member committee is comprised of two faculty members, three staff members, and one student. The committee is co-chaired by Tom Brophy, Senior Director, Student Services and Deborah Brothers-Scott, Diversity and Inclusion Advisor. Faculty members include Dr. Benita Bunjun, Assistant Professor and Dr. Gugu Hlongwane, Associate Professor in the Faculty of Arts. Raymond Sewell, Indigenous Student Advisor is the remaining staff member and the student is Mahmudur Rahman Shovon, VP Academic, SMUSA.

- Karen Morash, Secretary to the Senior Director, Student Service supports the work of the committee in an administrative capacity.
- There was an environmental scan done, looking at internal policies/procedures. A review of alleged cases of harassment and discrimination related to race from 2013-2018 were reviewed. A list was compiled of the individuals who have reached out regarding possible incidents. Data is being compiled on 47 incidents of alleged racism that were reported on forms. The committee will reconvene later this month to review the data gathered over the summer.
- We have a number of updated safety policies.
- Question: Do you have a sense of a timeline for a report to Senate? Answer: This is an ad-hoc committee that will report to the President by the end of term and then to Senate after that.

18005

**FALL GRADUATION LIST**

**Key Discussion Points:**

- The listing of graduates, designated as Appendix E, was circulated to Deans with a copy for Senate.
- Convocation is next Friday and Saturday, September 28 & 29<sup>th</sup> in the theatre auditorium. Faculty members were encouraged to attend.
- Graduate degrees in the Faculty of Graduate Studies at 7:00 PM on Friday. Undergraduate programs in the Sobey School of Business at 10:00 AM Saturday, and undergraduate programs in the Faculties of Arts and Science at 2PM Saturday afternoon.
- The Honorary Degree recipient is Rustum Southwell, Doctor of Civil Law, honoris causa.
- A total of 386 credentials will be presented to 365 graduates. Of these, 25 are graduating with distinctions.

Moved by Dr. Smith, and seconded, **“to confer degrees and distinctions on those represented on the list (circulated as Appendix B) at the Fall Convocation”.** Motion carried.

Moved by Dr. Smith, and seconded, **“to enable the Registrar to add such graduates to this list as may be identified subsequent to this meeting.”** Motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Takseva and seconded, **“that Senate extend the Senate meeting by 15 minutes.”** Motion carried.

18006

**MEMBERSHIP ON SENATE COMMITTEES FOR 2018-2019**

Senate Executive Memo -*Appendix F1*; “Nominations for Senate Committees for 2017-2018” Section A - *Appendix F2*

0101 APPEALS

- Dr Aldona Wiacek (ENVS/Science)
- Dr Coleen Barber (BIOL/FGSR – grad appeals only)
- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon\_ (*student rep appt’d by SA to Apr/19*)

.0102 ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE

- Dr Ather Akbari (ECON/BUS)
- Dr Ashley Carver (CRIM/ARTS)



- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)
- **TBA** (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)

.0103 ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE APPEAL BOARD

- Dr Ehab Elsharkawi (EGNE/Science)
- **TBA** (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)
- **TBA** (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)

.0104 ACADEMIC PLANNING

- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon\_ (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)

.0105 ACADEMIC REGULATIONS

- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon\_ (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)

.0106 CURRICULUM

- Dr Kai Ylijoki (CHEM/Science)
- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon\_ (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)

.0107 LIBRARY

- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon\_ (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)
- **TBA** (*student rep appt'd by FGSR to Apr/19*)

.0108 LITERACY STRATEGY

- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon\_ (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)

.0109 STUDENT DISCIPLINE

- \*Dr Veronica Stinson (PSYC/Science)
- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon\_ (*student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19*)

**Action Item:** Outstanding member nominations to be provided by **SMUSA**.

Moved by Bell and seconded, **“that the nominations for Section A of the Membership on Senate Committees 2018-2019 (circulated at Appendix F2), are approved as circulated.” Motion carried.**

**.02 SECTION B – NOMINATED BY SENATE FROM THE FLOOR OF SENATE** circulated as **Appendix C3**.

.0201 AGENDA (3 members of Senate, one of whom shall chair)

- Mr Ossama Nasrallah (1 student senator appt'd by SA to Apr/19)

.0202 BYLAWS

- Dr Myles McCallum (an elected faculty members appointed by Senate)
- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon (Student Senator elected by Senate to April/19)

.0203 ELECTIONS (5 elected members of Senate)

- Dr Abdul-Rahman Khokhar (elected member of Senate)

.0204 EXECUTIVE

- Mr Ossama Nasrallah (SMUSA President) (Student Senator elected by Senate to Apr/19)

.0205 LEARNING AND TEACHING

- Dr Valerie Creelman (COMM/Bus)
- Dr Coleen Barber (BIOL/FGSR)
- One part-time faculty members nominated by Committee – Dr Steve Cloutier (ENGL/ARTS)
- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon (One full-time student rep – nominated by SA/Committee to Apr 19)
- **TBA** (One part-time student nominated by OPTAMUS/Committee to Apr 19)

.0206 SCHOLARSHIP

- Mr Ossama Nasrallah (Student rep appt'd by Senate to April/19)

**AD-HOC COMMITTEES**

.0207 COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE INSTRUCTOR COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS

- Dr Jeff Power
- Dr Steve Smith (Acting Registrar)
- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon *(student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19)*

.0208 COMMITTEE ON ACCESSIBILITY IN THE SAINT MARY'S ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

- Ms Megan Adams, Acting Director, Fred Smithers Centre
- Mahmudur Rahman Shovon *(student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19)*

**JOINT COMMITTEES**

.0209 HONORARY DEGREES (2 members appointed by Senate)

- Mr Ossama Nasrallah (student rep appt'd by SA to Apr/19)

.0210 JOINT ACADEMIC COMMITTEE OF THE ATLANTIC SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AND SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY

- Dr Magi Abdul-Masih (RELS)
- Dr Syed Adnan Hussain (RELS)

PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEES

.0211 BUDGET (2 members of the faculty appointed annually by Senate)

- Dr Catherine Loughlin
- Dr Jeff Power

Moved by Bell and seconded, **‘that the nominees for Section B of the Membership on Senate Committees 2018-2019 (circulated at Appendix F3), are approved as amended above.’ Motion carried.**

**18007**

**PROPOSED DATES FOR SENATE MEETINGS FOR 2018-2019**

Circulated as *Appendix G1 & G2*.

Moved by Bell, and seconded, **“that the proposed dates for Senate meetings of 2018-2019 are approved as circulated”.**

**Motion carried.**

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

.01

## Academic Planning

- a) Modern Languages 2016-2017 Program Review documentation circulated as: **Appendix H** – APC Notice of Motion, **Appendix I** - Recommendation-Comparison summary, **Appendix J** - Self Study Report, **Appendix K** - Self Study appendices (1-21), **Appendix L** – Dean’s Response to Self Study, **Appendix M** - External Review Committee’s (ERC) Final Report, **Appendix N** - Department Response to ERC Report. (Please note: that the Dean’s response to ERC Report is found in Appendix H summary) (Dr McCallum)

**Key Discussion Points:**

- **Recommendation 1** This is outside of the Senate.
- **Recommendation 2** Senate concurs with the responses of the Program and the Dean.
- **Recommendation 3** Senate concurs with this recommendation and encourages the department to initiate this as soon as possible.
- **Recommendation 4** Senate commends the program for proactively initiating this recommendation
- **Recommendation 5** Senate concurs with the recommendation and encourages engagement with the classroom engagement strategy.
- **Recommendation 6:** Senate concurs with the Program Response.
- **Recommendation 7:** Senate concurs with this recommendation and asks the Department to refer to the recommendations and responses from the previous review in relation to the ICST program
- **Recommendation 8:** Senate supports and encourages the creative work related to the development of new programs.
- **Recommendation 9:** This is outside of the purview of Senate. Senate asks the Department to refer to the recommendations and responses from the previous review in relation to the ICST program.
- **Recommendation 10:** Senate concurs with the recommendation and encourages the Department to assist students in this regard.
- **Recommendation 11:** Senate encourages new program development. Much of this recommendation is outside of the purview of Senate.
- **Recommendation 12:** This is beyond the purview of the Senate.
- **Recommendation 13:** This is beyond the purview of Senate. Senate encourages the Department to have further discussions with the Dean on this issue
- **Question:** Recommendation number one was to suggest a maximum of 15 students per class. Why didn’t the APC comment on this recommendation on class sizes? While it is acknowledged

that there are resource implications, the APC terms of reference indicate that this does fall within the purview of APC. Specifically the Terms of Reference state that the Academic Planning Committee shall annually endeavour to assess the University's resources and constraints and establish short and long term goals, policies and procedures, both general and specific, relating to the viability, quality, expansion or contraction of its academic programs and to the overall direction of growth, and make appropriate recommendations to Senate. That sounds like this recommendation falls clearly within the purview of the APC to respond. Class sizes reflects directly on the program quality. It is troubling that APC is not responding. Answer: The issue is a balancing act between APC and the authority of the Deans and Departments to deal with these issues. It would be more appropriate for the Dean's and Departments to address this recommendation. It was noted that there were also implications related to teaching load, which is covered under the collective agreement.

- The motions submitted in Appendix H were withdrawn and the item was deferred to the October Senate meeting.

b) Mathematics 2017-2018 Program Review documentation circulated as: **Appendix O** – APC Notice of Motion, **Appendix P** – Recommendation-Comparison summary, **Appendix Q**- Self Study Report, **Appendix R** - Self Study appendices (R1-15), **Appendix S** – Dean's Response to Self Study, **Appendix T** - External Review Committee's (ERC) Final Report. [Please note that the Department and Chair's Response to ERC Report are found in Appendix M recommendation summary. (Dr Irving).

**Key discussion points:**

- Butler advised that APC presented feedback on all the recommendations from the reviewers.
- **Recommendation 1** - Senate supports the program and Dean's response related to the development and activities, while conscious of the Dean's response in relation to the development of faculty hiring and the Capital Campaign process.
- **Recommendation 2** - Senate welcomes any opportunity for new programs while recognizing the Dean's call for caution regarding existing calendar regulations related to double majors.
- **Recommendation 3** - Senate believes this is an important issue and encourages the Department to continue their discussions with the science curriculum committee.
- **Recommendation 4** - Senate encourages the review planned by the Department, and in that review, asks that the Department be mindful of the issues raised by the reviewers.
- **Recommendation 5** - Senate does not agree with this recommendation. Senate is more concerned that Honours requirements are consistent with what is done within the faculty.

### **Additional Recommendations**

- **Recommendation A** - Senate concurs with the Deans response on this matter.
- **Recommendation B** - Senate concurs with the Deans response on this matter.
- **Recommendation C** - Senate concurs with the Deans response on this matter.
- **Recommendation D** - Senate asks the Department to look at their hiring practices and consider best practices in the area of diversity and inclusivity prior to proceeding with future hiring processes

Moved by Butler and seconded that, **“that the Mathematics Program submit an action plan to APC in November 2018 based on the preceding responses”**.

and

Moved by Butler and seconded that, **“that in September 2019, the Mathematics Program submit a one-year report to the Academic Planning Committee on the progress made on the Action Plan according to Section 5 of the Senate Policy on the Review of Programs at Saint Mary’s University”**.

Moved by Takseva and seconded, **“that Senate extend the Senate meeting for another 15 minutes.” Motion carried.**

**.02** Agenda Committee of Senate – notice of motion, *Appendix U*.

#### **Key discussion points:**

- The Committee looked at the minutes of the Academic Senate for Universities across Canada and noted some gaps about how we record meetings. These motions reflect that investigation.
- The two-hour time allotment has been in place for a very long time while the university has continued to grow. More time is needed for a fulsome discussion in Senate.
- One identified gap was a VPAR report to Senate at each meeting. The VPAR responded that he saw the rationale for doing so if he had items to report but made it clear that he would keep his remarks brief and focused.
- At the commencement of every meeting we should recognize that we are in the territories of the Mi’kma’ki People. Concern was expressed regarding the wording of the acknowledgment and that it did not really acknowledge the historical legacy. The following is used during Convocation and will be utilized by Senate until such time as a more comprehensive one is proposed:

*We acknowledge our presence today in the traditional lands of Mi’kmaqi, the ancestral lands of the Mi’kmaw nation. This territory is covered by The “Treaties of Peace and Friendship” which Mi’kmaq and Maliseet peoples first signed with the British crown in 1725. The treaties did not deal with surrender of lands and resources but in fact recognized Mi’kmaq and*

*Maliseet title and established the rules for what was to be an ongoing relationship between nations.*

- These motions have impact on the Senate By-Laws since they change the order of and add items on the Agenda and extend the time of the Senate meeting. The motions below will be referred to the By-Laws Committee for implementation.

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the Senate Agenda be reordered to address the President’s report at the start of the meeting with a time limit of 10 minutes.” Motion carried.**

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that a VPAR’s report be added to the Senate Agenda to follow the Presidents Report with a time limit of 10 minutes.” Motion carried.**

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the question period be reordered to follow the VPAR’s report, the length of which is at the discretion of the chair based on business volume.” Motion carried.**

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that the Senate meeting time be revised from 2:30 to 4:30 to 2:00 to 4:30 pm.” Motion carried.**

Moved by Stinson and seconded, **“that at the commencement of every Senate meeting, SMU acknowledges that this meeting is taking place in Mi’kma’ki, the ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi’kma’ki People.” Motion carried.**

- .03** Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate – revised terms of reference, *Appendix V*. (Drs Takseva and Muir)

**Key discussion points:**

- Deferred to October Senate Agenda due to time restrictions.

**18009**            **NEW BUSINESS FROM**  
None.

**18010**            **PRESIDENT’S REPORT**  
To be posted as *Appendix W*.  
The report is posted on SMUport and hard copies are available from the President.

**18011**            **QUESTION PERIOD**  
None due to time restrictions

**18012**            **ADJOURNMENT**  
The meeting adjourned at 5:02 P.M.

Barb Bell,  
Secretary to the Office of Senate