

SENATE MEETING MINUTES

December 11, 2009

The 521st Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, December 11, 2009, at 2:30 PM, in the Secunda Marine Boardroom. Dr. D. Naulls, Chairperson, presided.

PRESENT: Dr. Murphy, Dr. Dixon, Dr. Butler, Dr. Enns, Dr. Wicks, Dr. Naulls, Dr. Barr, Dr. Beaulé, Dr. Bjornson, Dr. Charles, Dr. Crocker, Dr. Dawson, Dr. Kimery, Dr. McCalla, Dr. Pendse, Dr. Russell, Dr. Sun, Ms. Marie DeYoung, Mr. Hotchkiss, Ms. MacDonald, Mr. Anderson, Miss. Dix, Mr. Hirtle, and Ms. Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr. Dodds, Dr. Vessey, Dr. Neatby, Dr. Stinson, Dr. Stanivukovic, Mr. Gomez, and Mr. Mitchell.

Meeting commenced at 2:35 P.M.

09022 REPORT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE

The report of the Agenda Committee was accepted as circulated.

09023 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting of October 9, 2009, were *circulated as **Appendix A.***

The following amendments were noted:

- 09016 Standing Committees – 05-0101 Final Report of the External Program Review Committee on the Modern Languages and Classics Programs – second point – The department had developed and submitted a proposal well in advance of the initiation of the program review process. The external reviewers were taken by the suggestion and suggested it as an alternative.
- Fifth bullet – The Department was to come back to the Senate in 2012 with a review of progress made and reassessment of situation.

Moved by Russell, and seconded, **'that the minutes of the meeting of October 9, 2009 are approved as amended.'**
Motion carried.

09024 BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**Senate Committee on Academic Planning**

Annual report to Senate circulated as *Appendix B*

.0101 By-Laws Governing the Establishment, Reporting and Review of Institutes and Centres at Saint Mary's circulated as Appendix B.**Key Discussion Points:**

- This is a revised set of guidelines for Senate to consider for the establishment, reporting and review of Centers and Institutes. The original document was created in 1982. There have been an increasing number of Centres proposed in the last couple of years. Improvements to the policy were required.
- 2.3 – Preparation of the Proposal – “Once the Academic Planning Committee has reviewed the proposal, it will forward the proposal with its comments to Senate for consideration.” The Academic Planning Committee usually forwards a recommendation to Senate not comments. Question: Why is this terminology used? Answer: This is to allow for a proposal that may not receive the full support of the committee but that is deemed to have merit enough to bring to the Senate for a final decision.
- On the bottom of page one, in 3.2 Reporting Procedures, and in 4. Request for Modifications – amend the text “to the Senate for approval” to read “to the Senate for consideration for approval”. The existing text assumes approval.
- First page – “Initial request discussed with Dean and submitted to Academic Planning Committee”. Question: Why this extra step rather than the full proposal? Answer” The intention is not to put people to a lot of work developing a full proposal until an initial draft was approved by the Academic Planning Committee.
- First page first paragraph the last two sentences – definitions <<An institute is an organization which has research as its main concern. A centre will have a broader educational function including teaching and research as its main concerns.>> Question: Is this new text? Answer: No, only the words “it is assumed” were removed from the text in the original document
- It was suggested that the general perception of a Centre is not that it is inclusive of teaching. We have Centres on campus without a teaching component. As well, other universities follow a practice that doesn't follow this definition.
- Question: Are there any controls in regard to the website or academic calendar entries? Answer: No. We should undertake an audit of our website. No publication should list any center or institute not approved by the Senate. The suggestion was to put this statement into the academic calendar.
- Members were advised that the Gorsebrook Institute has four centres within it. Question: Were they approved by Senate? Answer: That information is not available at this time.

- A reference to officially sanctioned Centres is to be placed on the first page at the end of the first paragraph. Amend to read: “The steps to establish an institute or centre officially sanctioned by Senate consist of the following “
- Suggestion: Official institutional publications should list only those centres or institutes that were approved by Senate.
- First page – “each will be governed by its own constitution”.
Question: Is the constitution to be part of the proposal?
Answer: Refer to Appendix 1 on page 6 for the requirement for the proposed constitution.
- Question: The section on modifications suggests a certain amount of autonomy in that it allows amendments to an approved constitution. Is this wise? Answer: Any substantive change in objectives, scope, budgets, etc must go through the Academic Planning Committee to Senate for consideration for approval prior to being instituted.

Moved by Murphy and seconded, “**that the Senate approve the revised By-Laws Governing the Establishment, Reporting and Review of Institutes and Centres at Saint Mary’s as amended**”.

Motion Carried.

.0102 Gorsebrook Research Institute Annual Report attached for information only as **Appendix C**

Key Discussion Points:

- The Academic Planning Committee has made an effort to see that the Centres and Institutes report on an annual basis.
- There being no objections or questions, the report was accepted into the record

.0103 Atlantic Metropolis Centre Annual Report attached for information only as **Appendix D**

- There being no objections or questions, the report was accepted into the record

.02 Academic Regulations

.0201 Revision of Academic Regulation #8 Examinations attached as **Appendix E**.

Key Discussion Points:

- Members were advised that this year there was an inquiry in regard to the justification for requiring completion of a final exam for a web course on the campus. The student raised the point that there should be a reasonable expectation that exams and tests for distance courses could be done at a distance.
- Question: Would the same expectation apply regarding a night course? Answer: No. We don’t imply that the exam will be at night because the course is taught at night. We can not guarantee that.

- Question: Is there compensation for the proctors? Answer: Yes
- There is no security in regard to online exams. When an exam is being done at distance, the regulation does not state what medium is to be used to write the exam. Instructors are recommended not to use online exams, but the final decision on the method of evaluation is up to the individual instructor.
- Question: Is it possible to proctor an online exam? Answer: Remotely offered exams must be invigilated – this assumes that online exams would be proctored as well.
- It was noted that there are huge numbers of courses that have take home exams and those are definitely unproctored. Some institutions insist that every course have a formal valid proctored exam.
- The course outline will advise the students what is expected in relation to their exams.
- The following two paragraphs have been added into Regulation Eight.
 - h. In the case of courses delivered at extension centres, midterms and final examinations will take place at the extension centre. If the location is within the Halifax Regional Municipality, the final examination may be held on the Saint Mary's University campus, with the approval of the Dean of the Faculty.*
 - i. In the case of distance education courses taught via the internet or other means, the course outline will specify if midterms and final examinations will be held either online or at locations in reasonable proximity to the students. Remotely offered examinations must be invigilated by an invigilator (proctor) that is approved by the course instructor. The Division of Continuing Education will be responsible for working with the student to make arrangements for the test location and invigilation.*

Moved by Dixon and seconded, **“that the Senate approves the revision to Academic Regulation #8 as shown above.” Motion carried.**

.0202 Revision of Academic Regulation #16 Withdrawing from a Course, attached as **Appendix F**.

Key Discussion Points:

- Members were advised that for 3 credit hour courses, a student can withdraw without academic impact as long as there is 25% of the teaching left in the course. Currently for full year courses they have 10 days after the course starts in January to make a decision to withdraw. This isn't consistent. This proposal attempts to reconcile this situation.
- Question: Under e it mentions retroactive withdrawal. Where in the regulations does it explain what that is? Answer: The term is not defined. It is only mentioned in the financial information in 6.7.

Move by Dixon, and seconded, “that the revisions to Academic Regulation #16 are approved as submitted.” Motion carried.

.0203 New Academic Regulation #35 Intellectual Property, attached as **Appendix G**.

Key Discussion Points:

- Members were advised that the Academic Regulations Committee decided to add this as Academic Regulation #35. Students were recording lectures and this makes it clear who owns the property within a course.
- Question: Why does it fail to cover transcribing notes as well? Answer: When you as faculty are doing research and reading the work of others for ideas, we don't restrict that activity.
- It was suggested that this possibly needs more independent existence as it relates to intellectual property.
- Concern was expressed on behalf of students with a handicap.
- Deans are able to work with the Atlantic Centre in such cases to set up an understanding about the process and establish a clear understanding with both the faculty member and the student about how the information will be used. Unfortunately the Dean often only becomes involved after a conflict has already occurred.
- Concern was expressed in regard to the first paragraph first sentence <<lectures, demonstrations, performances, and any other course material produced by an instructor are the intellectual property of the instructor.>> The concern is related to copyright of those materials. Question: Are we talking about two separate things here? Answer: It would be very difficult to determine what has been created by the instructor and what hasn't.
- It was suggested that the point raised about written material is worth pursuing and perhaps incorporating.
- Question: What can you do if the student uses the material inappropriately? All of the concerns faculty have voiced ultimately arise around the concern “what would happen if?”
- It was suggested that student's who have paid for instruction should not be denied making recordings for private use.
- The notice of motion was withdrawn. **Action Item: Dixon** will consult with the University Lawyer on this issue.

.03 Curriculum Committee

Dixon advised that the curriculum report consisted of 137 pages and was not available from the printer by meeting time. By the January Senate meeting we will have the Calendar ready to go to the printer. We have to submit it to the printer for publishing by the end of January.

.04 Continuing Education

Annual report to Senate circulated as **Appendix H**

Key Discussion Points:

- Members were advised that there is a typographical error regarding the year. The annual report is for 2008-2009.

- There being no objections or questions, the report was accepted into the record

.05 Senate Committee on Scholarship

Annual report to Senate circulated as *Appendix I*

Key Discussion Points:

- It was noted that there are very succinct comments on what was done during the year but the report is very minimal. Senate would like to see more detail than this. At this time there is no template for reporting.
- There being no objections or questions, the report was accepted into the record

.06 Quality of Teaching Committee

Annual report to Senate circulated as *Appendix J*

Key Discussion Points:

- There being no objections or questions, the report was accepted into the record

.07 Research Ethics Board

Annual report to Senate circulated as *Appendix K*

- There being no objections or questions, the report was accepted into the record

09026 REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEES

None.

09027 NEW BUSINESS FROM

None.

09028 PRESIDENT'S REPORT

None.

09029 QUESTION PERIOD

Key Discussion Points:

- Question: Why is a major of study not printed on the parchment?
Answer: Our regulations state what is printed on the parchment. Students can request a non-standard parchment but that tends to look crowded. The normal process is that the student requests a custom parchment at any time in the process. There is a cost of \$50.00 for that custom parchment.
- Question: Don't modern printing techniques allow us to do this without additional costs? Answer: We chose not to make this the standard because it is not appealing – the end product looks very cluttered. There is also extra proofing required for custom parchments.

09030 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:46 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary to the Office of Senate