

Senate Meeting
Rosaria Boardroom

October 25, 2010
7:30 p.m.

Minutes

Present: R. Lumpkin (Chair), R. Bérard, D. Bourne-Tyson, E. Church, K. Dewar, S. Drain, R. Farmer, C. French, P. Glenister, L. Herrington, E. Hicks, J. Hollett, B. Jessop, N. Kayhani, K. Kienapple, B. MacInnes, M. MacMillan, L. Mann, P. Mombourquette, L. Neilsen, D. Norris, S. Perrott, R. Richards, J. Sawler, C. Schneider, J. Sharpe, L. Steele, B. Taylor, J. Tucker-Johnston, P. Watts, R. Zuk

Regrets: A. Davis, A. MacGillivray, R. MacKay, G. McGovern, C. Stewart

Guest: Kelly Gallant

1. Approval of Agenda

Moved by B. Jessop, seconded by L. Mann that the agenda be approved with Item 7.10 moved before Item 3.2. CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of September 27, 2010

Moved E. Church, seconded K. Dewar to approve the minutes with following addition after Item 12: the fourth paragraph under Item 5 should be changed to read: "L. Mann questioned the low operating costs for full-time equivalents and wondered why the low numbers at MSVU were seen as a negative"; and the addition after Item 12 of: "K. Dewar's request that Senate express its thanks to the interim President, Alexa McDonough, for her 15 months of service was granted with a round of applause." CARRIED

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

3.1 Conduct at Senate meetings

R. Lumpkin gave background on the statement of conduct as approved by Senate Executive. She read the statement of conduct to Senators.

[7.10] Nominations

R. Bérard reported that Peter Mombourquette has agreed to begin his term on Senate effective immediately to fill a recent vacancy.

3.2 Revisions to Senate Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuation of Academic Programs

Moved by E. Church, seconded by L. Nielsen that Senate approve the Revisions to the Senate Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuation of Academic Programs. CARRIED

E. Church highlighted the changes made to the Senate Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuation of Academic Programs.

S. Drain asked for clarification regarding the first bullet under procedures, wondering if the Dean would meet with faculty and students of the other programs as well as the home program.

E. Church responded that the Dean would meet with the Chairs of the other programs, and that the wording could be amended in the policy for clarification.

3.3 Revisions to Senate By-law 10.3, Nominations and Elections by Faculty Members

Moved by R. Bérard, seconded by L. Mann that Senate approve the revisions to By-law 10.3, Nominations and Elections by Faculty Members. APPROVED AS AMENDED

R. Bérard discussed the changes to the Senate By-law 10.3, noting the rationale as outlined on page 4 of the annual report.

L. Mann noted that this change reflects what had to be put into practice last year for Senators on leave due to illness.

R. Bérard added that the procedures for conducting elections are sometimes very time consuming with second and third calls for nominations.

S. Drain questioned item 10.3.3.3 and her suggestion changing the words “in order” to “in sequence” was agreed to.

3.4 Revision of Award for Research Excellence Call for Nominations

The Research and Publications Committee has not yet met to discuss this.

3.5 Revision to Policies and Procedures: Ethics Review of Research Involving Humans (Cf. 27 September, 2010 agenda documentation pp. 121-138)

L. Mann indicated that there is no difference between a student in an internship and a senior level student when it comes to approval of ethics.

S. Perrott noted that in internship the issue is more related to quality control than to research since the data produced is not being contemplated for publication but is for presentation to a supervisor.

L. Mann noted that interns do present to other interns and do not always report just to their supervisors.

R. Lumpkin suggested that L. Mann discuss the revisions with Michelle Eskritt, UREB Chair. This is a regular report of Senate so further discussion can take place.

4. President’s Announcements

R. Lumpkin expressed her gratitude to those who gave their time and knowledge to her during briefings over the summer. She thanked those that assisted with convocation and her installation as president. She also reported on the meeting of the university presidents with Marilyn More, Minister of Education, on the Tim O’Neill report. The key message from presidents to Ms. More was that they were disappointed in the tone and approach of the report’s pessimistic view of Nova Scotia universities and higher education in Nova Scotia. She also discussed other concerns expressed by Presidents during this meeting and the question of expectations of the government regarding the report.

5. Question Period

R. Zuk wondered if Senate could have a report on the status of staffing requests that were made in September.

R. Lumpkin responded that the VP Academic and VP Administration are working hard on coming up with numbers without knowing what the incoming government funding will be. They are close to coming forward with a decision on staffing.

K. Dewar asked if the Presidents have met with the Premier and, if not, would such a meeting likely occur.

R. Lumpkin responded that there has not been a meeting to date and she will be investigating if there is value to a meeting with the Premier.

L. Mann noted that there is a large number of requests for staffing and wondered how these requests were prioritized.

E. Church responded that department requests, enrollment numbers, hirings and vacancies over the past five years, and the Academic Plan were all considered by CAPP. The information is brought to CAPP for recommendations.

6. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

7. Committee Reports (Standing and Ad Hoc)

7.1 Senate Executive

R. Lumpkin reported that the committee discussed how best to compile a list of policies. P. Glenister has agreed to supervise a student to research Senate policies and compile a document.

7.2 Academic Appeals Committee

There was no report.

7.3 Academic Policy and Planning

7.3.1 Report of the Task Force on Distance Learning

P. Watts summarized the report of the Task Force on Distance Learning noting that research included a survey of faculty, consultation with Deans and Chairs, and research on other institutions. There are 20 recommendations: five deal with improving communications among distance learning, departments, and faculty; four look at expanding professional development for faculty; two deal with course models; three are around administrative issues for DLCE; two are planning issues; one deals with policies and procedures; and one is the recommendation that a report be brought back a year from this report.

E. Hicks wondered if DUET as a promotional tool was taken into consideration.

P. Watts indicated that it was but is less of a promotional model now as it has been moved from channel 33, which was more widely accessible, to the digital channel 333 which requires a subscription.

K. Dewar noted that on page 17, second paragraph, it states that Continuing Education has gradually declined. He wondered what the implications of this might be and what would be done to replace continuing education.

P. Watts responded that the activity of DLCE has focused on distance learning, an area of strength but DLCE would be able to collaborate on projects with departments.

K. Dewar expressed concern over the rebranding of the distance learning office and the loss of continuing education.

P. Watts expressed that there is no continuing education program at this time though the Mount still participates in programs at the Keshen Goodman Library.

B. Jessop responded to K. Dewar's comment indicating that there were several ideas coming from the community. He suggested getting a group together to discuss these ideas and opportunities.

P. Mombourquette noted that the Centre for Women in Business often provides a form of continuing education which offers opportunities to assist the university in moving forward.

7.3.2 Institutional Learning Plan (ILP) Terms of reference

Moved by E. Church, seconded by B. Jessop that SCOTL develop an Institutional Learning Plan (ILP) that would encompass all forms of course delivery. **CARRIED AS AMENDED**

R. Farmer asked if the Terms of Reference were in draft form.

E. Church responded that these are draft terms of reference.

S. Drain asked for clarification between an Institutional Learning Plan and an Institutional Learning Strategy noting that they are used interchangeably in the document.

P. Watts responded that the intent is that it would be a plan rather than a strategy.

E. Church responded "plan" could replace "strategy" throughout the document.

C. Schneider wondered how this might interfere with academic freedom.

E. Church responded that the plan is to explore ideas but not to set goals for use by faculty.

C. Schneider wanted to clarify to what extent the goals would become mandatory. She noted that people may not agree and challenge these goals.

P. Watts responded that this was discussed when planning the terms of reference. One of the goals of the planning process would be to help expand awareness of learning research that has taken place and not suggest that faculty must teach in a certain way.

R. Lumpkin noted that the plan would have to come to Senate for approval.

R. Zuk noted that it seems more about method than research and scholarship in teaching. She would be more comfortable if there was a statement on research and scholarship in teaching.

R. Lumpkin noted that this could be covered in a preamble.

R. Zuk agreed that a preamble would be sufficient.

L. Mann asked that the preamble include the aspects of academic freedom to ensure it does not evolve into something where faculty has to follow methods of teaching.

7.4 Graduate Studies Program and Policy Committee

7.4.1 Applied Human Nutrition New calendar descriptions

7.4.1.1 GAHN 6400/NUTR 4400, Issues in Food Product Development

7.4.1.2 GAHN 6414/NUTR 4414, Nutrition Education in the Community

7.4.1.3 GAHN 6417/NUTR 4417, Management and Revenue Generation in Nutrition and Food Services

Moved by K. Kienapple, seconded by L. Herrington that Senate approve calendar changes to GAHN 6400/ NUTR 4400, GAHN 6414/NUTR 4414, GAHN 6417/NUTR 4417. CARRIED

K. Kienapple noted that most changes were pertaining to courses that have not been taught in over ten years, with a substantial change to GAHN 6400. He also noted the cross-listing with nutrition.

7.4.2 PhD in Educational Studies Calendar entry

Moved by K. Kienapple, seconded by J. Tucker-Johnston that Senate approve the PhD Educational Studies calendar entry using the wording “PhD (Educational Studies)” throughout the document. CARRIED AS AMENDED

R. Farmer noted that in the memo this program is named a PhD in Educational Studies but in the description it is referred to as a Doctoral of Educational Studies (PhD).

K. Kienapple responded that it is a PhD and that the calendar description was developed by the IDAC and this is the wording agreed to by the committee.

J. Sharpe noted that it would be an acceptable amendment to change the wording to PhD (Educational Studies).

7.5 Graduate Studies Scholarships, Assistantships and Awards Committee

K. Kienapple reported that there have been two meetings. They have decided on a distribution plan for graduate assistantships and memos have gone out. He has met with students regarding the NSERC scholarship. There were two thesis awards given out during convocation this fall.

There will be changes proposed to how the graduate merit scholarships are administered to simplify the process.

7.6 Undergraduate Curriculum

7.6.1 Curriculum proposals

7.6.1.1 Applied Human Nutrition

J. Sharpe noted that the items are brought forward as information as they are editorial changes.

7.7 Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure or Permanence for Academic Administrators (CAPTPAA)

There was no report.

7.8 Committee on Information Technology and Services

There was no report.

7.9 Library

7.9.1 Open Access Policy

Moved by J. Sawler, seconded by R. Zuk that Senate approve the Open Access Policy.

CARRIED

J. Sawler discussed the policy and its importance, noting the value for the Mount to disseminate its research as much as possible.

R. Bérard noted that there are other universities across the country that takes a more directive role.

R. Farmer stressed the importance of complying with collective agreements especially regarding promotional files.

7.11 Research and Publications

There was no report.

7.12 Student Experience

7.12.1 Senate review of Student Experience Committee

J. Hollett gave background on the difficulty in getting the committee together, noting that there are a number of committees around student experience on campus. He wondered if the functions of this committee could be moved to other committees on campus.

L. Mann wondered why the work of a number of other committees, that seem to have been formed ad hoc, was not allocated to the Student Experience Committee.

J. Hollett responded that the work of the committees is ongoing and the other committees meet on a regular basis.

R. Lumpkin indicated two options: to canvass other universities for alternative ways to make the committee more effective, or to form a task force to come up with more specific recommendations.

M. MacMillan noted that this committee meets fewer than three times a year which makes it hard to form a rationale for its existence.

S. Drain noted that, although Senate is the body governing academic programming, not all learning takes place in the classroom, and it would be advisable for the two learning areas to have a formal communication link through the committee structure.

C. Schneider responded that the committee members have to figure out the focus of the committee and what they should produce as policies or actions.

R. Lumpkin suggested that the committee conduct a study of itself and bring recommendations to Senate. She felt a small working group could be formed including the current committee members.

J. Hollett noted that, except for him, all members of the committee are new to the committee.

D. Bourne-Tyson noted that there are parallels between this committee and other committees on campus and expressed interest in participating in the task force.

C. Schneider also expressed interest in participating in the task force.

R. Lumpkin suggested that the current committee members be part of the task force with the addition of D. Bourne-Tyson and C. Schneider.

J. Hollett indicated that the committee would be meeting and this will be discussed with committee members.

L. Herrington responded that students are interested but varying course loads make it hard to schedule meetings.

R. Bérard noted that, in the absence of a specific motion, the Committee, after consulting with its members and other interested parties, could bring back a recommendation to Senate with a motion attached.

R. Lumpkin responded that this should be the focus of the task force in consultation with other interested parties.

7.12.2 Task Force for revision of the Student Judicial Code and Handbook

Moved by R. Bérard, seconded by B. Jessop that a task force be struck, under the direction of the Associate Vice-President (Student Experience), to review and, after consultation with the

appropriate stakeholders, prepare a revised version of the Student Judicial Code and Handbook.
CARRIED

J. Hollett noted that the Student Experience Committee sees a small portion of the student judicial issues. There are areas such as security and housing where fines are issued for minor misdemeanors. He is concerned that there are staff members that are operating beyond the umbrella of the policy, making them vulnerable.

It was agreed that Senate Executive would assign the Task Force members.

7.13 Committee on Teaching and Learning

P. Watts reported that the committee has had one meeting at which Dr. Donovan Plumb was elected as Chair.

E. Church noted that the Mount has been asked to host the AAU Teaching Showcase for the fall of 2011.

7.14 Writing Initiatives

There was no report.

7.15 Undergraduate Admissions and Scholarships

There was no report.

7.16 University Research Ethics Board

There was no report.

8. Other Reports

8.1 Board of Governors

There was no report.

8.2 Students' Union

L. Herrington reported on the Town Hall discussion of the O'Neill report. There is a formal response to the O'Neill report on their website: mountstudents.ca. There are signs around campus asking students for comments on the O'Neill report. There will be a U-pass referendum on November 22 and 23. To raise money for the United Way, students will be busking around campus. She introduced Ryan Richards, the Education Student representative.

8.3 Destination 2012

There was no report.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Items for Communication

Revisions to policies, by-law, calendar changes

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Cynthia Black