

SENATE MEETING MINUTES
November 20, 2020

The 619th Meeting of the Senate of Saint Mary's University was held on Friday, November 20, 2020, at 2:00 PM, via Zoom. Dr Takseva, Chairperson presided.

PRESENT: Dr Summerby-Murray, Dr Butler, Dr Bhabra, Dr Brosseau, Dr De Fuentes, Dr Francis, Dr VanderPlaat, Dr Sarty, Dr Austin, Dr Bannerjee, Dr Grandy, Dr Grek-Martin, Dr Hanley, Dr Hart, Dr O'Brien, Dr Panasian, Dr Power, Dr Stinson, Dr Takseva, Dr Twohig, Mr Brophy, Ms Killam, Ms van den Hoogen, Mr de Chastelain, Ms Nankani, Mr Tumusiime, Mr Zokari, Ms Winters, Dr Smith, Ms Sergeant-Greenwood, Ms Milton, Dr Krishnamurti, Ms Green, Ms Morris, Professor MacNeil (EGNE), and Ms Bell, Secretary to the Office of Senate.

REGRETS: Dr Collins.

Meeting commenced at 2:02 P.M with the territorial acknowledgement.

21035 **REPORT OF AGENDA COMMITTEE**

It was noted that the item connected with Appendix S – Proposed definitions for modes of course delivery does not correspond to the published definitions that SMU had to post by Nov 1 for progress to be made on Banner setup.

The Senate Agenda was approved.

21036 **PRESIDENT'S REPORT** *Appendix A* (10 min)

Key Discussion Points

- **Discovery and Innovation in a Learning-centred environment**
 - On November 19, a student communication was circulated concerning “winter 2021 Term Course Delivery”. Faculty and staff members received an advance copy. A blended approach was announced, combining in-person and online offerings, for the winter 2021 term. Also included was information about the university’s holiday closure, travel guidance, winter term course delivery details and the university’s Safe Return to Campus Plan.
 - The Sobey School of Business hosted the National Retail Innovation Awards and a virtual Panel Discussion – Women in Retail, at which a panel of all-female leaders discussed their journey to executive positions in the retail sector.

- An excellent speakers' series has been offered over the past few weeks. The continued engagement of faculty members in class-leading research is heartening, as is the way in which media are picking up on the work of Saint Mary's researchers.
- **Intercultural Learning**
 - In November Saint Mary's was listed as a Designated Learning Institutions (DLIs) maintained by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC). We are ready to welcome international students back to campus under the federal protocols.
 - Attended an October 21 meeting of the Association of Atlantic Universities (AAU) Aboriginal Sub-committee where the goal was to work on recommendations for a presentation and discussion to bring forward to AAU's Regional Aboriginal Education Committee.
 - The President's Standing Committee on the Prevention of Racism met again on October 30 to follow up on the National Dialogues for Action on Inclusive Higher Education and Communities Conference, and to continue discussing implementation of recommendations from the earlier ad hoc committee's report.
 - The President's Advisory Council on Indigenous Affairs met on November 10 to provide various updates and to determine next steps on pertinent issues.
 - The National Dialogues and Action Inter-Institutional Advisory Committee is holding workshops later this month with the intention of completing the first draft of the 'Scarborough Charter' on inclusive education in Canadian Universities.
 - The next meeting of the Black North Initiative Education Committee will take place on November 26.
- **Institutional Sustainability**
 - We continue to work with federal and provincial governments to address challenges, and to work closely with CBIE and Universities Canada on all issues.
 - Chaired the CBIE Board meeting as well as their 2020 AGM (just an hour ago), as part of the annual conference which brought together over a thousand international education professionals from 41 countries. I continue to be heavily engaged with meetings with federal and provincial ministers and Canada's ambassadors in overseas postings, most recently with diplomats in China, Thailand and the Philippines.
 - Attended Universities Canada's Board of Directors Retreat, Membership Meeting and Business Meeting on October 27 and 28, focusing on the resilience of our universities and the importance of transformational change in our sector.

21037

VICE-PRESIDENT ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH REPORT

Appendix B (10 min)

Key Discussion Points:

- Winter full course registrations remain behind last year, but we see continued registration from students every week.

- The FCE Winter Registrations were presented.
- Fall & Winter Planning – We are working with EIT on classroom technology and are meeting with instructors planning on-campus components of courses.
- Accessibility Advisory Committee Update:
 - The deadline for application to join the committee was extended due to slow response to the call. We will be reaching out to potential members next week.
- Advisor Committee for VPAR – EDI:
 - Two advisory committees will be formed before the end of the term to support identifying and moving forward on initiatives in partnership with Mi'kmaq and African Nova Scotian Communities. They will include community representatives as well as members of the SMU community.
- Library Access in Winter:
 - Thanks was expressed for the hard work our Library has done to produce a plan to extend hours of access for students in the winter term.
 - Starting in January, there will be three slots per day (Monday-Thursday) and two slots per day (Friday-Sunday) which more than double the access currently available to students.
 - The potential for offering other student-facing services is being reviewed.
- 2019-2020 Annual Report, Animal Care Committee *Appendix U*
Key Discussion Points:
 - The chair of the committee was commended for their work.

In the absence of objections or revisions, the annual report of the Animal Care Committee was accepted into the Senate record.

- 2019-2020 Annual Report, Research Ethics Board (REB) *Appendix V*
Key Discussion Points:
 - The chair of the REB was commended for their work.

In the absence of objections or revisions, the annual report of the Research Ethics Board was accepted into the Senate record.

21038

SMUSA PRESIDENT'S REPORT *Appendix C* (5 min)

Key Discussion Points:

- **International Student Quarantine:** Students and their families are concerned about the Province of Nova Scotia's requirement to isolate for 14 days in one of three designated hotels. This comes at a cost of \$1,800 - \$2000 for each student. Many students have limited funds and will also be paying for rent and other expenses. The added cost may act as a barrier to a student wishing to return to Nova Scotia. Financial assistance and alternative low or no-cost options should be offered to international students and their families required to isolate upon returning to Nova Scotia.

- **Illness during the winter semester:** A protocol should be created and publicized before the start of the next semester, so students and faculty will have clear instructions if they miss in-person lectures, assignments or quizzes. Proper channels should also be identified for students who feel they are not adequately being accommodated.
- **Alternative Grading:** Circumstances in the fall term led a student to perform lower academically than they would during an in-person semester. Many students would benefit from the option of Pass/No Credit option for the fall term.
- **Affordability: Formal Complaint and Concern System** – Students do not have a formalized option to file complaints or concerns about faculty. Student fear bringing complaints to Chair, Coordinators or Deans for reasons of potential retaliation or dismissal. A formalized complaint system would address this as well as student satisfaction and academic success.
- **Extending Add/Drop Dates:** The winter term is offered as a hybrid model. SMUSA supports extending the Add/Drop date for the winter term because it would allow students more flexibility in choosing these classes.
- **Mid-Semester feedback:** Allowing more formal feedback at the midway of the semester would provide for changes to be made more immediately and would help improve academic success.
- **Modes of Communication:** The recent Brightspace outage highlighted problems with Faculty-Student Communication. Many students did not hear from professors during this outage because Brightspace is the only form of communication. Students felt left in the dark and want more ways to communicate with professors.
- **Updates**
 - Student NS Advocacy Week – November 2-6: Several members of SMUSA met with Government Representatives to advocate for students.
 - CASA Advocacy Month – SMUSA’s President and VP External participated in advocacy meetings with federal stakeholders and MPs. This has resulted in positive responses and support from key Ministers and federal departments.
 - Open Access Week and OERs – Oct 19-26: SMUSA hosted two promotion events. CAUL recently launched its Open Educational Resource Repository and is working to populate it with a wide variety of resources. The integration of these resources into courses would help remove students' financial barriers and often give more flexible material.
- The current provincial conditions placed on international students are challenging and are adding stress issues.
- SMUSA has a strong alliance with Students Nova Scotia and is working diligently to find resolutions to the current issues. We have talked with the government in regard to the self-isolation restrictions and related issues, and the initial response to the students’ concerns was positive.

21039

QUESTION PERIOD

Key Discussion Points:

- Question: Was there any response to McKinnon's article related to indigenization of the university? Answer: Yes. We are working diligently on this.
- Question: Is there a timeline on development goals? Answer: We are hoping to have something in early mid-winter term. There is an informal process being developed in consultation with the advisory council.

21040

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

.01 Minutes of previous meeting of October 16, 2020, *Appendix D1*.

In the absence of objections or revisions, the minutes of the meeting of October 16, 2020 are approved as posted.

.02 Minutes of previous meeting of October 26, 2020, *Appendix D2*.

In the absence of objections or revisions, the minutes of the meeting of October 26, 2020 are approved as posted.

21041

BUSINESS ARISING

.01 International student issues concerning accessibility of texts, copyright restrictions and timelines. A general communication with clearer guidelines around text issues and timelines is required. (Takseva and de Chastelain to identify a recommendation)

Key Discussion Points:

- De Chastelain reported that there has been no change on this issue. SMUSA can consolidate these concerns and plan to connect with the University Librarian and the Bookstore for consultation on this issue.
- The Library has also been working on this issue. A challenge is the international restrictions related to texts.
- The President advised that he is also advocating for access for international students. This is a national issue that all universities are working on. There are also software supports that are available that avoid these issues. Microsoft Stream is available and not as frequently blocked as other software. Messaging can be created to communicate this information again. An update will be provided in December.

.02 Student IDs (status)

Key Discussion Points:

- Killam emailed colleagues across Canada via the ARUCC listserv. She received 4 email responses related to their current student ID practices in a remote environment. All 4 institutions ask students to upload a photo (given specific photo requirements), provide their Student ID number and present government issued photo ID (passport

or NS ID card) for verification. This is consistent with our practice as well. A lot of these institutions also have services on-campus but have similar challenges in this regard that SMU has.

- We ask students to upload a photo and we verify that information in person. We do not ask for things like passports for privacy reasons. All ID requests have been processed and IDs generated. The Library is investigating additional software for this purpose.
- SCoLT discussed concerns relating to the occasional discrepancy between student photos and the person actually enrolled in the course.
- We need to consider that the best solution may be the smartcard option which contains a signature. There is more work to do here in relation to a future solution that works better. It is a very expensive system but it empowers students to a greater extent.
- Members were advised that universities with honour codes have had significant positive correlated impact on academic integrity.

21042

OUTSTANDING ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS

None.

21043

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

a)

Accessibility Committee (Krishnamurti, Green & Morris)

2019-2020 Annual report, *Appendix E1* – Memo, and *Appendix E2* - 8-1021 Senate Policy on Academic Accommodations for Students.

Key Discussion Points:

- Good feedback was received on the policy. An identified gap was an appeals process for the policy. The revisions address this gap. The new accessibility committee will be addressing this appeals process. It is important that these appeals are heard by people that have experience and background in dealing with this type of appeal.
- Question: Was any thought given to the specificity of accommodations? Example: providing accommodation related to flexibility with deadlines. It is easy if the accommodation is time and a half, but without specific guidelines, it becomes problematic for faculty to know how to deal with these requests. The following example was given: Accommodation was requested but the student submitted nothing in this course through the semester. With a lack of specificity, are we setting up the student for failure? Answer: Faculty need to be able to access training as needed on this issue. Instructors should reach out to the Fred Smithers Centre for guidelines. **Action Item: Green** will take this away for a discussion within her unit.
- Question: How will the appeal committee decide whether an accommodation was appropriate? Answer: The policy addresses factors that need to be considered and how the accommodations are going to be addressed by the instructor and student. This has to be articulated very clearly. If the faculty member feels that the accommodation is beyond their ability, that would be another discussion that would need to happen. Once the policy is

implemented and the community is working to that policy, perhaps that will address these concerns.

- The Fred Smithers Centre was reorganized as a support structure for the university at large and not just students. The centre should be able to advise and support the faculty members in terms of framing what the accommodation is precisely.
 - Who is on the accommodations appeals committee? Answer: The Accessibility Advisory Committee is new and a sub-committee of that committee will be addressing the functional operations of that committee. The committee will be happy to bring this information back to the Senate. The goal of this committee is to look at the broader aspects of this policy.
 - Question: What is meant by the reference to an ‘Academic Day’ in 8.3.1? Answer: It just means ‘Working Day’. This was accepted as a friendly revision.
 - A member advised of a situation where a student had an accommodation for an exam, and the faculty member did consult with the Fred Smithers Centre. The student’s issues were not properly documented, and that created an issue. We need specific definitions of accommodations that are to apply to specific situations. **Action Item: Green** will follow up with her staff and consult with Twohig and Takseva on this.
 - It was suggested that Saint Mary’s needs to look at universal design for learning. This is a topic that has come up during recent program reviews. We need some facilitated sessions on these techniques. This would likely reduce the number of accommodations that would be required and make this issue more manageable.
 - The Senate Standing Committee on Accessibility has taken the path of looking at universal design. Green and her group are also working on this. There was a session this morning on this topic.
 - Many of the techniques and pedagogies that are evolving out of the COVID-19 work are applicable to the area of universal design.
 - More investigation is needed into how we can work to support faculty. This would include better identification of those who have disabilities (specifically learning or processing disabilities - ADHD etc.), which will have a corresponding affect on how faculty “perform” their teaching and research duties.
 - Thanks were expressed for all the good work done thus far.
- Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that Senate approve the Senate Policy on Academic Accommodations with the revision identified above predicated on the terms of reference for the Appeals Committee will come back to Senate for review/approval. Motion carried.**

b) Academic Planning Committee

- a) MPHEC 2nd Cycle of the Quality Assurance Monitoring (QAM) Process, **Appendix F1**– APC Memo, **Appendix F2** – SMU_MPHEC_QAM_Final Report_Letter and **Appendix F3** – SMU_QAM_Action Plan.

Key Discussion Points:

- In early July Saint Mary's underwent the second cycle of the MPHEC's Quality Assurance Monitoring Process. This was an assessment of Saint Mary's University's Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures. The final report was received in August.
- The University was required to submit an action plan based on the recommendations of the reviewers.
- **Recommendation 1** – For Senate to consider how the term 'program review' is interpreted in the application of its policy, particularly when reviewing the component parts of large degree programs (e.g. the Bachelor of Commerce).
*This will be a task that an APC sub-committee will consider. A program, unit and degree level review all have different cycles. Currently, the only degree program that is impacted is the B.Comm). That review is currently underway. The language in our program review policy was kept general in case another applicable program was developed.
- Question: When should such a review happen in the Faculty of Arts? Answer: The degree in the Faculty of Arts is not structured in the same way. The BA review is done based on programs. It is very different from the B. Comm.
- Question: If we wanted to make this relevant community-wide how would that be done? Answer: SSB had agreed what the B. Comm core is. The Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science are different, and they have not done this.
- **Recommendation 2** – To consider how formal communications between Senate and Board can be improved, to facilitate decision making, together with ensuring appropriate representation from Faculty and Academic Support Units. This is particularly relevant where the allocation of resources is needed to support recommended changes as a result of program review. This particularly applies to items coming out of program reviews. There has been a suggestion that the Senate Chair be added to the membership of the Board of Governors in an advocacy role on behalf of students and instructors. This position would be rooted in the academic knowledge of the institution. Response: The SMU Act defines the membership of the Board. This is something the governance committee of the Board would have to consider. The goal is to open discussion on this item, and perhaps even a co-discussion between the Board and Senate.
- **Recommendation 9:** To develop greater opportunities for the student voice to be heard and ensure that students are aware of how their feedback in evaluations and surveys is responded to.
 - This item relates to how the ICE form is utilized. There is a sub-committee of Senate that is currently reviewing the Instructor Course Evaluation process.

- Members were advised that the terms of reference for the Ad Hoc Committee do not extend to the usefulness or applicability of the evaluation tool.
- Question: Should we extend the work of this committee or is this another committee that is only looking at the pedagogical issues? Answer: Senate Committees should be more policy focused. Perhaps we should reconsider the committee mandate.
- The Ad Hoc Committee Chair advised that reviewing the evaluation tool is not currently the role of this committee. If the committee mandate is extended in this way, the committee would be duplicating the efforts of a previous committee led by Dr Crooks that was struck specifically for that purpose.
- The Academic Planning Committee was tasked to discuss this and report a status in December or January. **Action Item: APC.**

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that Senate approves the SMU QAM Action Plan for submission to MPHEC in response to the Assessment Report of Saint Mary’s University’s Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures.” Motion carried.**

- b) Institute for Computational Astrophysics (ICA), *Appendix G1* – APC Notice, *Appendix G2* - 2018-2019 annual report, *Appendix G3* – 2020 ICA Self-Study

Key Discussion Points:

- There was significant discussion on this submission at meetings of the Academic Planning Committee. Concern was expressed about whether the fine work that was being done was a result of individual faculty and their personal research, or a result of the Institute for Computational Astrophysics (ICA) as a structure covered by the Senate Policy. This same concern existed at the time of the last self-study.
- APC is recommending a one-year probation period for the ICA to address this issue.
- Concerning the ICA response to Section 3.3 ii) a) & b) of the Senate policy, the APC has requested that the ICA reflect on the reasons why Saint Mary’s designates a Centre as `Senate Approved`. ICA is asked to address why they should be continued as a Senate approved research institute, specifically:
 - What is the institute doing that is unique and differentiates activities of the ICA from those of the Department of Astronomy & Physics? What activities can be undertaken by the Institute that are not reflective of normal collaborative activities in the discipline between internal researchers and, potentially, external collaborators?
 - How is the ICA enhancing research and scholarship activities in the broader context? What other activities can the

Institute undertake to create broader awareness and engagement with its research activities (e.g. talks, conferences, workshops)?

- Institutes fall under the FGSR mandate. Both Deans reviewed the materials very closely and share the view of APC.
- Question: Have the faculty members involved with the ICA been informed about these concerns? Answer: After the previous self-study, they were made aware of these concerns. It was decided that Senate approval would be appropriate prior to bringing this concern back to the ICA a second time.
- Question: Would one year be enough for the ICA to be able to meet the Senate objectives? Answer: In terms of the Senate Policy, a one-year probation period is stipulated. That does not mean that a further one-year probation period could not be approved.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that in accordance with section three of the Senate Policy 8-1009, the Senate assigns the Institute for Computational Astrophysics with probationary status for a period of one year [Senate Policy #8-1009 Section 3.3 ii) a) & b)]. During this time, ICA must address concerns identified by the APC, demonstrate significant actions in response, and have immediate plans to meet the criteria as defined for the approval of Centers at Saint Mary’s”.**

Motion carried

- c) CN Centre of Occupational Health and Safety (CNCOHS), *Appendix H* – CNCOHS 2019-2020 Annual Report.

Key Discussion Points:

- This is an example of a Centre that is functioning extremely well.
- The financial reporting could be enhanced so that is clearer and more transparent. This part of the policy will be enhanced in the near future.

In the absence of objections, the Senate accepts the CNCOHS 2019-2020 annual report as meeting the requirements of section 3.2 of the Senate Policy Governing the Establishment, Reporting and Review of Institutes and Centres of Saint Mary’s University.

- d) Engineering Program Review Documentation (Don O’Neil)
Appendix J – APC Notice of Motion, *Appendix K* – Recommendation-Comparison summary, *Appendix J*- Self Study Report, *Appendix L* - Self Study appendices (G1-Gx), *Appendix M* – Dean’s Response to Self Study, *Appendix N* - External Review Committee’s (ERC) Final Report, *Appendix O* - Department Response to ERC Report, *Appendix P* –Dean’s Response to ERC report..

Key Discussion Points:

- This program runs according to the Associate University System where students study two years at SMU and then transfer into the Engineering program at Dalhousie. Students work according to the Dalhousie accreditation process.

- This was a very positive review with good engagement and response by the program.
- **Recommendation 1:** Senate supports the responses of the program and the Acting Dean. Senate looks forward to outcome of further discussion between the VPAR and Dean as they work with the program to resolve this issue.
- **Recommendation 2:** Senate supports the responses of the program and the Acting Dean. Senate looks forward to outcome of further discussion between the VPAR and Dean in working with the program to resolve this issue.
- **Recommendation 3:** Senate supports the efforts of the program and encourages engagement with any appropriate university initiatives and opportunities that may arise.
- **Recommendation 4:** Senate endorses the responses of the Dean and program and encourages further discussions related to this recommendation.
- **Recommendation 5:** Senate congratulates the Division on their commitment to ensuring opportunities for students to stay on track in their program. Senate supports the program's decision, to reduce the Diploma Program by three credit hours.
- **Recommendation 6:** Senate appreciates the efforts of the Division to facilitate student engagement with Library resources. Senate concurs with the Division and Dean's responses.
- **Recommendation 7:** Senate supports the response of the program and shares their concerns.
- Question: Do we have a systemic issue? We deliver the first two years. Are students taking a reduced workload at SMU, and then when they transfer into the program at Dalhousie in their existing cohort-based system, is there a possibility of a systemic barrier for those that participated at SMU but may not continue at Dal?
Answer: This is part of the challenge of working in a collaborative program like this. There have been discussions around how to support students through the transition to Dalhousie. Other universities have programs to address this situation that we may adopt to help SMU students. We are looking at ways to address these issues.
- Discussion on this with Dalhousie identified that the reality of the graduation rate of our students entering Dalhousie is over 90%. It was suggested that some students in our program who are accommodated by taking fewer courses per term may have concerns about participating in a strict cohort system, with a fixed number of courses per term.

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that the Engineering Program submit an Action Plan based on the preceding recommendations, to the Academic Planning Committee in time for the March 2020 meeting of the APC”.** Motion carried.

and

Moved by Butler and seconded, **“that in November 2021, the Engineering 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”**. Motion carried.

- c) Student Discipline Committee,
2019-2020 Annual report, *Appendix Q*.

Key Discussion Points:

- This committee’s mandate is very focused on the Student Code of Conduct. That policy was approved

In the absence of objections, the Student Discipline Committee annual report was accepted as revised into the record of Senate.

- d) Academic Regulations Committee
2021-2022 Academic Calendar of Events, Notice of Motion, *Appendix W1*, Academic Calendar of Events, *Appendix W2*. Significant consultation and consideration

Key Discussion Points:

- Question: What about the Dec 8 Patronal Feast date? This calendar indicates that Faculty must work but administrative staff do not. This is the wrong signal to send to faculty. Either we should honour the origins of SMU as a community or not as a community. Answer: In the Staff Collective Agreement, it is designated a staff holiday. In the SMUFU Collective Agreement it is not designated as a holiday. In the process of creating the Calendar of Events, it is stipulated that we would sometimes have to have exams on this date. The Academic Senate approved that process.
- The President advised that it is not unusual for universities to have a ‘Patronal’ day. This designated day is applied in differential ways.
- Question: The second semester starts on a Monday and ends on a Wednesday. This should be checked to ensure there is an equivalent number of M/W and T/R teaching days. Answer: **Action Item: Bell** to check to the number of teaching days and make the appropriate revisions if they are necessary.

Moved by The Academic Regulations Committee, **“that the Senate approved the 2021-2022 Academic Calendar of Events to include the second term revision of teaching days if appropriate.”** Motion carried.

21044

NEW BUSINESS FROM

- a. Floor (not involving notice of motion)
.01 Fiscal 2020 Presentation - annual report to Senate to list all gifts over \$5,000 in compliance with the Gift Acceptance Policy, *Appendix R*. (Ms Sergeant-Greenwood)

Key Discussion Points:

- Sergeant-Greenwood gave a PowerPoint presentation reflecting the information in Appendix R.
- The Academic and Administrative faculty and staff of SMU work diligently to secure these gifts.
- There are two significant gifts that were affiliated with the Wicked Problems Lab project. We were given a challenge grant to match one of these gifts. These expanded the scope of that project. We are looking forward to welcoming this project into a physical space on campus in the coming months.
- Appreciation was expressed to faculty and staff for their donations.

.02 Discussion concerning extending drop date for winter term 2020-21.

Key Discussion Points:

- This subject was in the SMUSA report today. Students responded well to this adjustment in the fall term. Given that we are going to be in an unusual circumstance again, should we do this again?
- Concern was expressed related to students arriving very late in the previous term and potentially having difficulties (especially in some courses) catching up with missed content.
- A member supported the request to extend the drop date for winter term 2020-21. This is a risk-free thing to do. This would provide extra flexibility but also allows students to join later in term which could be problematic in some courses.
- The last date for adding courses is 12 January. Could we move this to Friday, 15 January? That is only an additional 3 days.
- In addition, could we move the last date for dropping a course to 19 January?
- Concern was expressed that student loan signatures and the requirement for international students to maintain their eligibility to remain in the country could be impacted by this revision. Students will not understand what the implications are until it is too late. Response: Several other universities have already decided to delay their start date.

Moved by Austin and seconded, **“that Saint Mary’s extend the current date to add and drop dates without penalty for the 202120 term. The last day to add courses in the 202120 term will be January 15 and the last day to drop courses is 19 Jan 2021.” Motion carried.**

.03 Proposed definitions for modes of course delivery, *Appendix S*.

Key Discussion Points:

- This topic came from a discussion that occurred during a previous Senate meeting. It was also brought up during the Q&A session at one of the Faculty/Staff or Town Hall meetings. The Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning discussed this at their November meeting and, subsequently, the Studio shared a document titled “Delivery Modes” that was revised from a document shared with them from MSVU.
- Discussion previously established that on November 1 SMU had to identify the definitions for the SMU community. This is being provided for discussion purposes only.
- This document was circulated for feedback to faculty, SMUSA and the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching (which included the Associate Vice-President on Teaching and Learning and The Studio). Feedback was implemented.

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

- Both faculty and students have experienced many similar feelings and workload issues. There may be ways in which we can work together toward improvement.
- A member advised that the information that has been provided is valuable, however, there are some situations where faculty deviate from the conditions articulated in their syllabus. The SMU Community needs to comply with the Academic Regulations and the content of their syllabi. They must not arbitrarily change the manner of presenting their course.
- Saint Mary’s is currently functioning outside of normal established processes. Some of the issues being experienced are due to current circumstances and require deeper consideration. If faculty are not following their syllabus, students are able to access the appeals process to address those issues.
- Some students fear appealing issues. We need to be actively involved to ensure that faculty know and understand their responsibilities.
- The Associate Deans have done extraordinary work, in collaboration with a many of the support units, to engage with faculty on these issues. More work is needed to support faculty in each of these areas.
- Question: Where should this item go for consideration? Answer: These are not the definitions that we are currently using. The definitions we are using were created in consultation with the fall and winter planning groups. There are limitations related to the information that can be entered into Banner. There are some subtle differences between what has been submitted and what we currently have in place.
- It was noted that in Appendix S, the Studio provided a definition of blended course delivery that is different from what the university provided in their email communication circulated to students on November 19. These definitions should be consistent. The Studio definition states “The instructor and students are required to meet in person.” This is different from the University statement that all course work, assessments, and participation will have virtual options

for students who cannot attend the in-person activity. **Action Item:**
Bell to forward this to Woods/Butler/Smith to revise.

Moved by Grandy and seconded, **“that this item be deferred to December’s Senate meeting.” Motion carried.**

.04 Discussion Item: challenges and opportunities in remote delivery of curriculum in the fall and winter terms, *Appendix T*.

Key Discussion Points:

- No discussion due to time restrictions.

.05 Instructor Course Evaluation process: long-term considerations, ICE Committee update (Power)

Key Discussion Points:

- Discussed earlier under the QAM Action Plan item, Recommendation 9. No further discussion due to time restrictions.

21045

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.

Barb Bell,
Secretary of Senate