

Senate Meeting  
Rosaria Boardroom

March 8, 2010  
7:30 p.m.

## MINUTES

Present: A. McDonough (Chair), R. Bérard, I. Blum, D. Bourne-Tyson, K. Darvesh, S. Drain, R. Farmer, M. Finney, P. Glenister, F. Harrington, L. Herrington, E. Hicks, J. Hollett, B. Jessop, N. Kayhani, K. Kienapple, M. Lyon, A. MacGillivray, B. MacInnes, R. MacKay, J. MacLeod, M. MacMillan, L. Mann, J. Neilson, S. Perrott, I. Pottie, C. Schneider, J. Sharpe, G. Solomon, L. Steele, B. Taylor, J. Tucker-Johnston, D. Varga, S. Walsh, P. Watts, R. Zuk

Regrets: R. Warne

Guests: Kelly Gallant, Donovan Plumb, Felicia Eghan, Janice Keefe, Information Technology Students

Dr. Lyon called the meeting to order explaining to Senators that Alexa McDonough, Chair, was participating in a number of events on campus today, but would be attending the meeting. She welcomed new members to Senate: Dr. Ron McKay and Dr. Susan Drain. As well as the following guests: Kelly Gallant, Donovan Plumb, Felicia Eghan, and Janice Keefe.

1. Approval of Agenda

**Moved** by J. Hollett, seconded by J. Tucker-Johnston to approve the agenda as circulated.

Alexa McDonough, Chair arrived during the approval of the agenda.

2. Approval of minutes

2.1 Approval of Minutes of February 1, 2010

**Moved** by D. Bourne-Tyson, seconded by M. Lyon to approve the minutes with minor corrections. CARRIED

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

3.1 Add Rule of Order 2.4 to Senate By-laws

**Moved** by I. Blum, seconded by E. Hicks that Senate approve the addition to Rule of Order 2.4 to the Senate By-laws. CARRIED

4. President's Announcements

A. McDonough commented on the strengths of The Mount including financial strengths, Strategic Planning, and new initiatives

She also discussed her meeting with Tim O'Neill, noting that there is a memo being drafted to send out to the University community. The deadline for Mr. O'Neill's report to government is due at the end of May. She thanked those that helped to quickly pull together information with short notice: M. Lyon, B. Jessop and L. Mann as President of the Faculty Association.

5. Question Period

L. Mann wondered when Tim O'Neill's summary of what he took from the meeting with MSVU would be sent to MSVU.

B. Jessop responded that Mr. O'Neill had other commitments, but a report should be forthcoming by the end of March.

L. Mann asked if the document would be shared with the Mount community and noted the importance of sharing this information.

A. McDonough responded that she didn't see a reason why it couldn't be circulated.

R. Zuk wondered what category of questions he had and if those same questions are being used for each meeting.

A. McDonough noted that the first round of information from Tim O'Neill was circulated.

B. Jessop responded that Tim O'Neill did have some pointed comments regarding the finances, the model, the MOU and whether 11 universities are needed in Nova Scotia. B. Jessop noted that Mr. O'Neill gave the opportunity for input and the Mount had good responses for his questions.

A. McDonough will have the information from Mr. O'Neill and Brian Jessop regarding the meeting circulated.

M. Lyon noted that Mr. O'Neill had questions about the types of programs offered and student enrollments.

6. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

7. Committee Reports (Standing and Ad Hoc)

7.1 Senate Executive

There was no report.

7.1.1 Ratification of replacement Senate representative on Deans' Search Committee

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded J. Neilson that Karen Blotnicky be the Senate Representative on the Deans' Search Committee CARRIED

7.2 Academic Appeals Committee

There was no report.

7.3 Undergraduate Curriculum

7.3.1 Deletion of courses not taught in the last five years

7.3.1.1 BIOL 3330, Flora of Nova Scotia

7.3.1.2 BUSI 2208, Topics in Insurance

7.3.1.3 BUSI 2258, Fundamentals of Law

7.3.1.4 BUSI 3305, Managing E-Commerce

7.3.1.5 THMT 3322, Environment and Facility Planning

7.3.1.6 THMT 4409, Strategic Management for Tourism and Hospitality

7.3.1.7 ECON 2224, Economics of the Arms race

7.3.1.8 ECON 3306, Welfare Economics

7.3.1.9 HIST 3333, Native and European Contact in Early Colonial Canada

7.3.1.10 MATH 2280, Computer Applications in Operations Research

7.3.1.11 RELS 3304, Spiritualities

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by S. Perrott that Senate approve the deletion of courses not taught in the last five years. CARRIED

J. Tucker-Johnston wondered if these courses have been open to enrollment during the past 5 years and not taught due to low numbers.

J. Sharpe responded that these courses have been recommended by the Departments to be dropped from the curriculum. This is normally due to curriculum changes in the department.

R. Farmer wanted to clarify that these courses have gone to the departments and been agreed upon by the department.

J. Sharpe responded that this was correct.

### 7.3.2 Changes to existing programs

#### 7.3.2.1 Education new course EDUC 5334, Advanced Studies in the Sociology and Anthropology of Education

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by R. Bérard that Senate approve the addition of EDUC 5334. CARRIED

S. Drain wondered if this was going to be one of three Year 2 electives offered each year.

J. Sharpe responded that usually two are offered and it depends on scheduling and demand.

#### 7.3.2.2 Family Studies and Gerontology

##### 7.3.2.2.1 Changes to existing program: minors and concentrations in Family Studies and in Gerontology to replace B.A.A. (FSGN)

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by K. Kienapple that Senate approve the addition of a minor and concentration in Family Studies, and the addition of a minor and concentration in Gerontology with an amendment on page 29 that FSGN 3402 for each of the concentrations and minors listed be replaced with FSGN 3345. CARRIED

J. Tucker-Johnston wanted to clarify that the motion is not for the discontinuation of the major in Family Studies & Gerontology. J. Sharpe responded that in the report from Family Studies it was recommended that new programs be put in place before any discontinuation of programs.

J. Keefe asked how not being a professional program would factor into the department being under professional studies. J. Sharpe noted that they would be under the Bachelor of Arts regulations. M. Lyon responded that the question of where programs would fit within faculties has to be discussed.

J. Keefe clarified that it does have implications on how the program is promoted and where they fit within the structure of the university. M. Lyon responded that a large number of students enrolled in these courses are enrolled in a Bachelor of Arts.

D. Varga thought it important to note that it was not just a decision of UCC, but that there was communication and response from the department. B. Taylor responded that it was also discussed at the Art & Science Chairs' meeting.

##### 7.3.2.2.2 Change in minor groups

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by K. Kienapple that Senators approve the addition of Family Studies & Gerontology under the list 4.B. Social Sciences in the Academic Calendar and the removal of Family Studies & Gerontology from the list of Professional minors in the Academic Calendar. CARRIED

##### 7.3.2.2.3 Addition of new courses

###### 7.3.2.2.3.1 FSGN 2100, Healthy Aging

###### 7.3.2.2.3.2 FSGN 3345, Strategies for Planned Change

###### 7.3.2.2.3.3 FSGN 3401, Contemporary and Professional Ethics Issues in Aging and Families

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by K. Darvesh that Senate approve the addition of FSGN 2100, FSGN 3345, and FSGN 3401. CARRIED

##### 7.3.2.2.4 Deletion of courses

###### 7.3.2.2.4.1 FSGN 2207, Physiological Aspects of Aging

###### 7.3.2.2.4.2 FSGN 3304, Mental Health in Late Life

###### 7.3.2.2.4.3 FSGN 4408, Family in Later Life

###### 7.3.2.2.4.4 FSGN 3346, Social Policy in Long-Term Care

###### 7.3.2.2.4.5 FSGN 3342, Advocacy: Structural and Personal Processes

###### 7.3.2.2.4.6 FSGN 4433, Family and Social Policies

###### 7.3.2.2.4.7 FSGN 4400, Ethical Issues in Family Studies and Gerontology

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by M. Lyon to approve the deletion of FSGN 2207, FSGN 3304, FSGN 4408, FSGN 3346, FSGN 3342, FSGN 4433, FSGN 4400 TABLED

J. Keefe commented that these courses are vital to the BAA in Family Studies and Gerontology program which at this time is still in progress and can not be discontinued until Item 7.4.8 is dealt with.

**Motion** by J. Sharpe, seconded by K. Darvesh to TABLE the motion. CARRIED

### 7.3.2.3 Public Relations

#### 7.3.2.3.1 Change to existing program: addition of minor in Communications Technology

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by E. Hicks that Senate approve the addition of a minor in Communications Technology. CARRIED

R. Farmer commented that the document throughout mentions INTE 2263 Web Design, noting that the title in the Academic Calendar is INTE 2263 Introduction to Web Design and Development and is cross-listed with CMPS 2263.

S. Drain wondered if this program should be listed as a Minor under the Bachelor of Arts in the Academic Calendar as it can be taken by any student. J. Sharpe responded that it will be noted as a calendar edit.

R. Farmer wondered if there was a correction required on page 59, 7.2 where it refers to a Minor in Information Communication Technology. J. Sharpe noted that the word Information should be removed and was missed in the edits.

S. Drain noted that in the document on page 56 (top of page) it refers to discussions between the departments of Public Relations and Information Technology. She wondered if there was anyone from either department who could speak on those discussions.

R. Farmer commented that the departments did have lengthy consultations and wanted to avoid redundancy. The words “skills” within the document is bothersome to the department of Information Technology and should be replaced with “knowledge”. He wanted to point out that there was only one Information Technology course included. K. Kienapple responded on behalf of the Public Relations department noting that the focus of their proposal is on the cultural and real world implication of technology as its influencing communication in our day-to-day existence. The department felt this balance was appropriate given what came out of the external review.

#### 7.3.2.3.2 Addition of new courses

##### 7.3.2.3.2.1 COMM 1015, Introduction to Communication Technology

##### 7.3.2.3.2.2 COMM 3025, New Media in Public Communication

##### 7.3.2.3.2.3 COMM 3017, Ethics in Public Communication

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by G. Solomon that Senate approve the addition of COMM 1015, COMM 3025, COMM 3017. CARRIED

R. Farmer noted that there seems to be a disconnect on page 63 of the document. Under 5.a) it refers to use of a Moodle site and 5.e) refers to computer facilities being non-applicable.

J. Sharpe responded with a friendly amendment to the document to replace the N/A under 5.e) with “occasional access to computer lab”.

#### 7.3.2.3.3 Deletion of course: PBRL 4017, Public Relations Ethics

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by D. Varga that Senate approve the deletion of PBRL 4017, Public Relations Ethics. CARRIED

R. Bérard wondered if this course was being replaced by Ethics in Public Communication. He questioned whether a person would be able to get credit for Public Relations Ethics if they have already completed Ethics in Public Communications. J. Sharpe responded that they should not be able to get credit for both and this should be added to the course description. K. Kienapple

responded that the reason for the new course was to change the level of the course and to add new content as it relates to technology. There was a discussion at UCC and it was decided that it was a new course, with sufficient new content and students could take both for credit.

S. Drain was unhappy that students be allowed to take both courses for credit; noting that there was a lot of overlap in the course descriptions, she suggested it go back for discussion. K.

Kienapple responded that the new content in the course makes it sufficiently different with the inclusion of social communication, social networking and technology aspects.

S. Perrott commented that if there is a sufficient amount of overlap that one course usually disqualifies the other.

M. Lyon suggested that the proposal go back to the department for further review. J. Sharpe agreed to withdraw the motion.

S. Drain noted that withdrawing the deletion of the course is not appropriate and that the new course already approved needed more added to it.

J. Sharpe noted the department can come back with a change to the new course.

I. Blum suggested that the motion be voted on as it is presented and that J. Sharpe report back in the future and if necessary the motion can be reconsidered in the future.

J. Sharpe agreed that he could report back to Senate on the discussions of UCC regarding this course.

### 7.3.3 Changes to existing courses (for information)

#### 7.3.3.1 Family Studies and Gerontology

#### 7.3.3.2 Women's Studies/History

R. Farmer noted a typo on Page 80, the word "stkills" should read: "skills".

### 7.4 Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP)

#### 7.4.1 Policy and procedures for the temporary suspension of admissions in academic programs

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by L. Steele that Senate approve the revisions to the Senate Policy and Procedures for the Temporary Suspension of Admission in Academic programs. CARRIED

M. Lyon noted that this was previously brought forth and discussed at Senate.

K. Darvesh reviewed the changes made to the document with Senators. The intention of the changes was to clarify what was not clear at the last Senate meeting.

G. Solomon wanted the document to include Students as stakeholders on page 85, under 2.c. and suggested the document read: "...shall meet with students (stakeholders) to discuss..."

B. Taylor asked if the goal was to ensure students were included as stakeholders and recommended that students be added under Item 3.

Senators agreed that a change would be made to Item 3 to read: "...as well as feedback from students and other stakeholders arising from the Dean's consultation." Students are also being included in the attached flow chart.

S. Drain wondered how stakeholders were being defined under item 2.c noting it could be a wide array of people.

S. Walsh noted that students should also be included in the flow chart.

S. Drain wanted the colon (:) removed from the last paragraph under B. Principles.

J. McLeod wondered why the flow chart showed stakeholders as only having discussions with the Dean and not with the department or the VP Academic. M. Lyon responded that it is the responsibility of the Dean to have discussions with stakeholders. Stakeholders are able to have discussion with whomever they'd like, but the university can not tell them they have to have these discussions.

Senators agreed that the flow chart will be revised to include an arrow going both ways between stakeholders and Dean. It was noted that the flow chart is not a part of the policy.

N. Kayhani commented that a former version of part B. noted the President could initiate and end the process, and with discussion through Senate this was changed. She feels that the problem now exists with the VP Academic being at both ends of the process. She also commented that Senate should have a vote, not a recommendation, when discussing the temporary discontinuation of

programs. K. Darvesh responded that Senate would make the recommendation and the President would make the final decision.

D. Varga wanted to confirm that there was discussion during the last Senate meeting that Senate makes a motion, not a recommendation.

R. Bérard commented that Senate makes its recommendations with a motion. M. Lyon responded that it is a recommendation from Senate and the President makes the final decision. The intent of the procedures is to ensure transparency through the process. The changes being made are based on comments from Senators.

R. Farmer noted a conflict with the VP making the initial recommendation and the final decision. He noted that both the VP Academic and President sit on Senate, so are apprised of recommendations coming from Senate.

N. Kayhani noted that the VP Academic is involved in the initial step, on CAPP, on Senate, and in the final step; therefore voting on the motion four times.

S. Perrott agreed that it was more of a conflict of interest for the VP Academic rather than being a redundancy in the process.

R. Bérard noted that the recommendation that comes from Senate could be substantially different than what comes from CAPP and the VP Academic could relay that information to the President.

R. Farmer wondered if that would be a conflict. R. Bérard responded that the recommendation at the beginning stage could be different for example new options that are realized during the process could be incorporated.

D. Varga noted that the Senate motion, along with the view of the VP Academic, would be presented at the Board level.

L. Mann wanted to note that the President was removed from the first step as requested at the last Senate meeting.

I. Blum discussed the job description of the VP Academic as being the senior academic officer in the university. As the President may not always have an academic background he found it important that she/he have an informed Academic VP. He noted the procedures that are currently in place have controls over the role of the VP Academic.

D. Varga felt that in terms of the formal role of Senate that the recommendation should go to the President and not the VP Academic.

**Motion** by N. Kayhani, seconded by R. Zuk that the Policy be amended the Policy on page 84, item 4. to read: "That Senate make a recommendation to the Vice President Academic who will pass on the recommendation to the President.". DEFEATED J. Neilson asked that his abstention be recorded.

B. Jessop noted that this was discussed and changes made at the last Senate meeting. He noted that all information would be brought forward from stakeholders to the President from the VP Academic.

M. Lyon noted that she could not foresee the President making a decision to suspend admission to a program without consulting the Vice President Academic.

E. Hicks noted that the VP Academic is not the final decision maker.

K. Darvesh wanted Senators to be aware of the language being used in the documentation. She noted that the term "pass on" is not respecting the structure within the university.

L. Steele commented that it is a good policy and that it is a transparent process as it is.

S. Perrott noted that the VP Academic has an important opinion to provide. He asked for clarification on what motion is being voted on.

I. Blum discussed the parliamentary procedures noting they are currently voting on the motion to amend the motion and that if this motion passed it would require changes throughout the document.

D. Varga asked that Senators be respectful of people's recommendations and allow people to speak openly.

L. Herrington wanted to clarify that the flow chart is not part of the official document. K. Darvesh confirmed that it is for information only and not part of the document.

#### 7.4.2 Revision to Guidelines for Setting Academic Calendar Dates

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by A. MacGillivray that Senate approve the changes to the Guidelines for Setting Academic Calendar specifically the date for Fall Convocation. CARRIED

R. Farmer wondered what impact the change in dates had with regards to other institutions. B. MacInnes responded that she had researched Convocation dates at other institutions. Each university has a different date for their convocations.

R. Farmer asked if there were any potential conflict with MSVU. B. MacInnes responded that the dates changed from year to year at other institutions, so there was no information on an actual set date.

M. MacMillan wondered if any consideration was given to weather when deciding on a date. B. MacInnes responded that there was discussion on the weather.

P. Glenister asked when this would take effect. B. MacInnes noted this would take effect in the 2011 Calendar year.

P. Glenister noted that Senate had already approved Calendar dates for the 2011 Calendar year. B. MacInnes noted that Senate had approved the calendar dates for 2010 and tentative dates for 2011.

R. Bérard noted that, by moving to November and back into Standard Time, when graduates moved outdoors for photos there will be crows in the trees and it will be dark.

F. Harrington suggested the wording might read: "The Sunday following Remembrance Day".

B. MacInnes responded that it was the weather factor that prompted the move to the second Sunday in November.

#### 7.4.3 Official version of the MSVU Calendar

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by A. MacGillivray that Senate approve the recommendation that the .pdf versions of the online MSVU Undergraduate and Graduate calendars be the official versions of the calendars. CARRIED

M. Lyon noted that traditionally the print version was the official version of the calendar. Last year the online version of the calendar was referred to as the official calendar. With the changes to the website, it has become apparent that the .pdf version should be the official version of the Academic Calendar and the one that is archived.

B. MacInnes noted that the web based calendar has immediate changes made to it, whereas the .pdf version would be static with no changes made to it once it is published.

D. Varga wanted clarification on the wording on page 93 referencing that the documentation notes edits and/or corrections to misprints can be made throughout the calendar year. B.

MacInnes responded that changes would be edits or minor corrections and they would be made to both the web based and .pdf versions of the Calendar.

S. Drain questioned the timing of having the print versions of the Calendar, noting the change in Early Advising dates and the need for printed versions. B. MacInnes responded on the dilemma of having an updated web based calendar and expressed concern over going to print with a calendar that is not current. Changing the print date from February to May/early June ensures the print version is up to date.

R. Farmer wanted to ensure that Senators understood that the .pdf version online could have changes such as minor edits and/or corrections to wording and such. He also noted that he makes changes to .pdf documents all the time. B. MacInnes responded that changes would be edits and/or corrections to misprints and not Senate approved changes as these only take effect in September of the new academic year.

R. Farmer wanted to ensure that past calendars will be archived and available online.

P. Watts wanted to ensure that the .pdf will be an exact replica of the print version.

B. MacInnes responded that this was true.

J. Tucker-Johnston questioned when the calendar would be available for students. B. MacInnes responded that in the past, when calendars were sent out for printing in February there was a 6-8 week turn around time. This year, calendars will be printed in-house and they will be available

within a couple of weeks of being sent to the Print Shop. There will be a complete version online.

#### 7.4.4 MOU between MSVU and New Brunswick Community College

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by B. Jessop that Senate approve the Memorandum of Understanding between Mount Saint Vincent University and the New Brunswick Community College. CARRIED

M. Lyon gave background on the MOU noting it is the same as the agreement with NSCC. S. Drain questioned what schedule was being referred to on page 93, paragraph 3 when discussing the transfer of credits between MSVU and the Diploma program at NBCC. M. Lyon responded that it is the schedule of articulated courses. It mirrors the language used in the agreement with NSCC. This schedule lists the courses that are transferred with the equivalent course at the other institution.

#### 7.4.5 MOU between MSVU and Shanghai Normal University

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by A. MacGillivray that Senate approve the proposal to adopt a Memorandum of Understanding with Shanghai Normal University. CARRIED

M. Lyon gave background on the MOU. Shanghai Normal University and MSVU will develop an articulation agreement on the transfer of credits so that students at Shanghai Normal University begin their degree in Tourism and Hospitality Management and Business Administration at Shanghai Normal University and complete it at MSVU via distance learning or by coming to campus.

I. Pottie wondered if the Exchange of Scholarly material clause as noted on page 101 had an effect on agreements with publishers of peer reviewed articles or research databases by granting access outside of our country. M. Lyon responded that there is no breach of copyright. These are standard clauses in most agreements and also cover the exchange of textbooks, course outlines and other materials.

#### 7.4.6 Deletion of Sociology/Anthropology Joint Honours with Dalhousie

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by B. Taylor that Senate approve the discontinuation of the Joint Honours Degree in Sociology/Anthropology offered jointly with Dalhousie University. CARRIED

#### 7.4.7 Public Relations name change to Communication Studies

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by K. Kienapple that Senate approve the Departmental name change from the Department of Public Relations to the Department of Communication Studies. CARRIED

R. Zuk wondered if Public Relations consulted with students and alumnae about the departmental name change. K. Kienapple responded that there was consultation with alumnae and members of their Advisory Board. The Undergraduate degree as well as the Graduate degree will remain Public Relations; only the department name where it will be housed is being changed. M. Lyon noted the changes in the department and the wide array of programs that are now housed in the department.

R. Farmer thought it was a disadvantage to not have a representative from Public Relations at the meeting. He has questions regarding the process and degree of consultation with the department on the name change.

S. Drain spoke of her discussions with the department chair and noted that they did have discussions regarding the title of the department.

#### 7.4.8 Recommendation to discontinue Family Studies and Gerontology programs



**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by K. Kienapple that Senate approve the discontinuation of the Bachelor of Applied Arts (Family Studies and Gerontology) and the Certificate in Gerontology. CARRIED

M. Lyon provided background on the recommendation. She noted the strength of the Graduate Program and the addition of the new Concentration and Minor to be taken within any undergraduate degree. Students who complete an undergraduate degree with the minor and concentration will have the requirements for admissions to the Masters program which specify an undergraduate degree in a relevant field or discipline.

R. Zuk asked for guests of Senate from the department to comment on the history of this decision. J. Keefe discussed the process and recommendations of the external reviewers and the challenges of the department. The department wants to move forward with its Masters program and the minor and concentration.

L. Mann wondered what would happen to the department and how this was going to affect their current structure. M. Lyon responded that the Graduate program will still be offered along with the undergraduate Minor and Concentration; therefore there is currently no pressing need for change to the department. If there is an academic restructuring, a decision would need to be made; for example, it might be that the department should be aligned with the department of Child & Youth Study or the Social Sciences.

**Motion** by J. Sharpe, seconded by S. Drain to remove Item 7.3.2.2.4 from the table. CARRIED

**Moved** by J. Sharpe, seconded by M. Lyon to approve the deletion of FSGN 2207, FSGN 3304, FSGN 4408, FSGN 3346, FSGN 3342, FSGN 4433, FSGN 4400. CARRIED with three opposed

#### 7.4.9 Recommendation to discontinue Information Technology programs

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by K. Darvesh that Senate approve the discontinuation of the Bachelor of Applied Arts (Information Technology), Diploma in Information Technology, Diploma in Information Technology and Computer Science, Certificate in Information Technology and Bachelor of Arts Co-operative Education Route with Integrated Major (History/Information Technology).

R. Farmer wanted to note that not all Senators received the entire Senate package by email. P. Glenister noted that copies of the department's response to CAPP were sent electronically to all members of Senate and available in four locations on campus to review.

R. Farmer wanted to highlight that there are 30 plus students enrolled in these programs; 20 plus of whom are in the Bachelor of Applied Arts in Information Technology primarily in their 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year as the department has been under temporary suspension and enrolment for 2 years prior to any policies in this area. Discontinuation of the program requires, by MPHEC standards, for courses in the program to be removed from the calendar. This creates a disadvantage to students who are currently in a cooperative route program and are competing with students from universities such as Dalhousie who have their credentials listed online. He wanted to know what the advantage was to current students to bring the discontinuation forward now. M. Lyon responded regarding the calendar. She noted the program will remain in the calendar while students are enrolled in the program and will be in the archived calendars for reference. There is a note in the current calendar stating that students are not currently being admitted. K. Darvesh responded that if a program is not discontinued then it is being offered. She referred to the Academic Plan and the resources that would be required to continue the program. J. Sharpe noted that the Policy passed on suspensions noted that the suspension was for a period of 2 years and that a decision needs to be made at that point.

R. Farmer noted that the program's suspension was done prior to the Policy being implemented. He noted that there is no advantage to current students.

R. Farmer wanted to know if the administration looked into the implications to funding for international students that are in their 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year. M. Lyon noted that current students are completing the degree to which they were admitted, but there would be no more students

admitted to the program. It was an approved program for funding them and she sees no reason why that would change. Questions regarding specific students should be referred to Jeff Hollett. J. Tucker-Johnston stated that the Information Technology field changes all the time. She wondered why they were discontinuing the program while advertising for it on campus. She noted that the NSCC IT program is doing well and wondered why an articulation agreement with NSCC was not pursued. She recognized the value attached to a Community College diploma as opposed to a University degree and the need for a degree to move into management positions. M. Lyon responded that it was a difficult decision. It is an issue of whether the University has the resources to put into the program based on responses from the external reviewers which recommended the hiring of 2 to 3 faculty. There were discussions with the Department of Business regarding a merger and including an IT component, but the Department of Business felt the merger of the two departments to not be a good fit for them. She noted that 14 faculty members, three students and six Deans have reviewed the data related to the discontinuations in IT. She noted that three additional faculty positions as recommended by the Reviewers would have to come from the overall allocation from other programs.

**Moved** by B. Jessop, seconded by A. MacGillivray that Senate extends the meeting until 11:00 p.m. at which time the meeting will adjourn. **CARRIED**

R. Zuk wanted to clarify that the students concern is the perception of the quality of the program. J. Neilson commented that he is against any discontinuation of the program. He noted concerns that students have about what the discontinuation means for them. It is a difficult time for this program, but opportunity can be presented.

D. Varga noted the responses from both current and past students who want to support the program. The situation for the department could be different at this point in time given the broader interest in Information Technology beyond a skills approach. Senators need to consider something other than discontinuation and that the University needs to support the program in new and different ways.

G. Solomon noted that the university is taking steps to ensure that students are informed and will be able to complete their degrees and graduate. He would not like to see resources taken from viable programs to be put into a program that is not attracting students.

L. Mann noted that there does not seem to be any other option for the department as was the situation with Family Studies & Gerontology. She feels it is short sighted to discontinue the program at this time and that more information on articulation agreements should have been investigated; once the program is discontinued that option has been removed.

L. Herrington felt that adding faculty resources to the Information Technology program would take from other programs that need faculty; disadvantaging students with large class numbers who need faculty resources.

B. Jessop commented on the emails received from students and the concerns regarding class sizes. He agrees that it is a difficult decision to discontinue a program but feels that resources need to be applied to programs where there has been substantial growth.

J. Hollett remarked that there have been discontinuations of IT programs at other universities as well; noting the need to put resources into other areas on campus.

R. Farmer wanted to have Senate recognize the guests and faculty that are attending in support of the Information Technology program and asked that they be able to speak.

R. Zuk wanted to clarify that if IT was discontinued that other departments would have smaller classes. B. Taylor responded that if faculty resources have to be put into the IT program then faculty resources will have to come from other departments.

R. Zuk wanted to note the money saved by the University with retirements, resignations, etc. B. Taylor responded that in relation to her original question on class sizes he is not willing to give up the required faculty in other departments.

S. Walsh commented on the difference between the motion to discontinue Family Studies and the motion to discontinue Information Technology. She noted that without other options for the program in place there is nothing to stop the complete elimination of the program. There are no concentrations or minors outlined in the documentation for the IT program. K. Darvesh

responded on the issue of no alternative indicating that a recommendation was made to the Task Force for a minor and concentration; it has not yet been developed. The recommendation is to offer a post-graduate program or a program for students who return from the workforce to upgrade.

S. Walsh noted that there were program changes voted on by Senate for the Family Studies and Gerontology program before the vote for discontinuation took place. She noted that there is nothing in place for the Information Technology program or in the recommendation. K. Darvesh noted that there was a minor. M. Lyon responded that the proposals for the Family Studies and Gerontology program came forward from the Department through the UCC to CAPP. Students want to take courses in information technology; the department should continue to offer a minor and look at what courses are viable for the department in the future.

R. Farmer asked if there was information in the Business Department's review that impacts the decision to discontinue the Information Technology program. M. Lyon responded that information from the review would not impact the decision.

D. Varga commented that she would be more in agreement if there was a plan in place that the students and department were in agreement with. She would like to see something developed before a vote took place.

G. Solomon noted that there are a number of students wanting to speak and asked if the Chair would allow them the floor.

A. McDonough asked for a spokesperson from the guests to speak on behalf of the students. Brian Hughes (IT Student) spoke on the impact this decision would have on him and other students in the program. He referred to a study on the promotion of IT programs to high school students and the percentage of advertising in this field being low. He noted that there could be a loss of co-op placements due to the discontinuation of the program. He wondered why students in other departments didn't get IT training as part of their program as it is useful to most fields of study.

A. McDonough pointed out that it is clear this is not an easy decision and asked if there was a call for the vote. I. Blum noted that according to the By-laws the meeting has to adjourn and such a vote at this time might not be legitimate. The requirement of the by-laws is that the meeting resume two weeks prior which would have Senate meeting again on March 22, 2010.

B. Jessop questioned if a motion to extend could be put forward. I. Blum noted that a motion was already put forward to extend until 11:00 pm.

### **Minutes from the continuation of the March 8, 2010 meeting convened at 7:00 pm on March 29, 2010.**

Present: R. Bérard, I. Blum, D. Bourne-Tyson, K. Darvesh, S. Drain, R. Farmer, P. Glenister, F. Harrington, L. Herrington, E. Hicks, J. Hollett, B. Jessop, N. Kayhani, K. Kienapple, M. Lyon, A. MacGillivray, B. MacInnes, R. MacKay, J. MacLeod, M. MacMillan, L. Mann, A. McDonough (Chair), J. Neilson, I. Pottie, J. Sharpe, G. Solomon, L. Steele, B. Taylor, J. Tucker-Johnston, D. Varga, S. Walsh, P. Watts, R. Zuk

Regrets: M. Finney, S. Perrott, C. Schneider, R. Warne

Guests: Paula Crouse, Kelly Gallant, Geoff McCarney, Chelsea Stewart

A. McDonough called the meeting to order at 7:35 pm on Monday, March 29, 2010.

**Moved** by J. Hollett, seconded by F. Harrington to ratify the decision of Senate Executive to resume the March 8, 2010 meeting on March 29, 2010 rather than on March 22, 2010 as prescribed in By-law 6.1.2. **CARRIED**

S. Drain asked how this might affect the agenda for tonight. A. McDonough confirmed that the meeting would convene at the point of the agenda where the meeting was adjourned on March 8

to complete the outstanding agenda items and then move to the regularly scheduled March 29 agenda.

#### 7.4.9 Recommendation to discontinue Information Technology programs (Continued)

R. Farmer indicated that there are Senate members who have not spoken on this issue and may want to at this meeting.

N. Kayhani discussed the possibility of having the discontinuation of Information Technology deferred for a period of two years to give students an opportunity to finish their course work and graduate, and for the department to investigate ways to stay viable, giving the department time to restructure.

P. Crouse was invited to speak on behalf of faculty in the department and on behalf of Information Technology students. She questioned the suspension of admission before a document on suspension and admission had been approved and asked Senators to vote not to discontinue of the Information Technology program. She noted that a calendar and web presence is important for the department which needs more time renew.

**Moved** by R. Farmer, seconded by N. Kayhani that the motion to discontinue Information Technology be deferred for a period of two years. DEFEATED

M. Lyon clarified that there will be Information Technology courses available for students completing their IT degree as well as for students in other programs. Keeping the program on the books without admitting students keeps the department from moving forward with other options. S. Drain noted that the issue had not been dealt with well but agreed with Dr. Lyon that it is time to put this issue to rest and move on to making proper academic decisions.

R. Farmer wanted to clarify that his motion to defer the decision for two years is to allow current students to graduate with pride knowing that their program is still in place at the time of graduation.

J. Johnson-Tucker supported the motion to defer the discontinuation in order to allow students to finish both their programs and co-op work terms. E. Hicks wondered what the financial implications would be to keep the program open for two years as faculty are still in the department. M. Lyon clarified that courses would not disappear but would remain in the calendar and on the website, though admission would be suspended.

J. Sharpe spoke against the motion noting that it was delaying the outcome. Students admitted to the program will graduate from the program and should do so with pride.

D. Varga discussed the discontinuation of the Family Studies and Gerontology program noting that its solution to support the future of the department after the discontinuation of the undergraduate degree. She spoke of public perceptions of both the community and students of the Mount.

G. McCartney wanted to offer a report from the Saint Vincent's Nursing Home and its relationship with Information Technology students. Students are currently working on a database for Saint Vincent's to record critical incidents for monitoring and tracking purposes. Saint Vincent's is hoping to continue a relationship with the Information Technology students. A. McDonough clarified that students that are currently enrolled in the program will be fully supported through completion of their program, including co-op placements. M. Lyon clarified that CAPP's recommendation is to discontinue admissions, not to abolish the department.

R. Farmer noted that once notice of a program discontinuation is communicated to MPHEC the program is discontinued for good. K. Darvesh noted that MPHEC requires a submission of a plan for students that are currently in the system to be able to graduate. R. Bérard discussed his role in other program discontinuations at other institutions and noted that students in programs are able to finish their degree and there seemed to be no effect on the credibility of those graduates.

S. Walsh noted that there is no clear plan in place for the continuation of courses once the department is discontinued. She agreed that this is the difference between the discontinuation of Family Studies and Gerontology and Information Technology and wondered what the commitment was from the University to continue courses in the IT program. M. Lyon responded

that there is an Information Technology component in the new Communication Studies program. She agreed that the Family Studies and Gerontology department anticipated their situation and produced a proposal for the department but nothing comparable was proposed from the Information Technology department.

J. Neilson commented that there is a disconnect with students. He noted that students graduating from the program will be supporting the department and faculty that fought for them, and not the University.

I. Blum clarified that Senators are voting on the motion to defer the discontinuation of Information Technology for a period of two years

N. Kayhani wanted to note the motion has two parts: to allow students to finish their program, and to allow the department sufficient time to create alternatives.

L. Steele raised a point of order regarding the validity of the motion to defer the discontinuation for two years. J. MacLeod agreed with L. Steele noting that present Senators would be attempting to dictate the discussions of future Senates by deferring for a period of two years. B. Jessop mentioned that there have already been two years of suspension of admission to the Information Technology program and there have been graduating classes in that time, and, during that time, no viable proposals were made by the department. R. Farmer responded that all documents that were received after the temporary suspension referred to a period of two years. Noting the difference between suspension and discontinuation, he felt it was not up to the department to do anything in that time. He noted the CAPP report indicates that the Dean should work in consultation with the department.

**Moved** by R. Zuk, seconded by N. Kayhani that the votes be recorded in the minutes.  
DEFEATED

L. Herrington wondered what the rationale was for recording votes, noting that votes were not recorded for the discontinuation of Family Studies and Gerontology. D. Varga noted that recording of votes is not an unusual procedure. A. McDonough noted that the normal procedure is to record votes if it is asked to be recorded by the voter. R. Farmer asked that I. Blum, as parliamentarian, to make a decision on this. I. Blum responded that there is no direction in the Senate By-laws; past practice of Senate has been to indicate votes by a show of hands with no votes recorded. He suggested that R. Zuk's motion be voted on.

**Moved** by M. Lyon, seconded by K. Darvesh that Senate approve the discontinuation of the Bachelor of Applied Arts (Information Technology), Diploma in Information Technology, Diploma in Information Technology and Computer Science, Certificate in Information Technology and Bachelor of Arts Co-operative Education Route with Integrated Major (History/Information Technology). CARRIED (22 in favor, 10 opposed) with the following Senators asking that their opposition be recorded: R. Farmer, N. Kayhani, L. Mann, J. Neilson, J. Tucker-Johnston, D. Varga, R. Zuk

**Moved** by S. Drain, seconded by N. Kayhani that Senate direct CAPP to initiate a process and establish a timeline for the development of offerings in Information Technology within the academic programs of the University, with particular reference to – but not limited to – the recommendation set out in 1. (f) of the Academic Plan (page 3), and to report to Senate on that initiative no later than its meeting in January 2011. CARRIED

K. Darvesh responded that things that come to CAPP are usually through the department to the Dean and the Curriculum Committee. R. Farmer noted that the CAPP report recommends consideration for creation of a new program be done under the leadership of the Dean. M. Lyon responded that the program had been considered for alignment with Business Administration but Business was not receptive to the alternatives proposed. There are recommendations with regards to IT courses in different programs and CAPP can suggest collaborations, recommendations, etc. but the proposals need to come forward from departments which might be involved.

S. Walsh asked where the responsibility lay for insuring the ongoing vibrancy of IT before it is discontinued. K. Darvesh responded that curriculum proposals can come from departments at any time. K. Kienapple responded that the Dean would be very involved in helping redevelop an IT program on campus.

S. Drain noted that it is in the Academic Plan that IT would be addressed. She noted that CAPP should take some initiative on this issue and not wait to be approached by the 2.5 faculty members in the department.

J. Tucker- Johnston discussed the aspect of morale within the department, especially with the decision to discontinue now having been made; a plan should be in place for faculty and students as reassurance that they will be looked after.

R. Bérard wondered if Senate had the power to direct the Dean. He suggested asking an individual as opposed to a committee to bring forward recommendations that would come to CAPP. S. Drain responded on the motion stating it is to direct CAPP to take action and initiate a process in whatever way advisable and report back to Senate on its progress. I. Blum noted that there is no issue with Senate directing its committees, with the motion, from a procedural point of view. K. Darvesh wanted Senators to understand that they are directing a policy committee to develop curriculum which may not be procedurally incorrect since curriculum proposals should come from departments. S. Drain clarified that the motion directs CAPP to initiate a process, not develop curriculum.

#### 7.4.10 Updated Academic Program Review Schedule (for information)

M. Lyon spoke on this issue noting that all of the academic reviews that have been completed will be coming to Senate soon. The Women's Studies programs, both undergraduate and the Joint graduate, and the two remaining Education programs will be completed next year.

#### 7.4.11 Report on External Review of Political and Canadian Studies (for information)

M. Lyon touched on the major points of the Review noting that it indicated that the POLS and CANA programs were both strong and that the Department offered, and contributed to, an array of programs with limited resources by careful structuring and sequencing of courses. CAPP is recommending that the major in Political Studies and Canadian studies remain. The Reviewers had a number of specific recommendations regarding curriculum which CAPP recommended that the Department consider carefully. The Departments have already implemented a number of the Reviewers' and CAPP's recommendations.

J. Neilson commented that, as a Canadian Studies major, the review spoke of the particular dedication of Dr. Della Stanley. As well, he is proud to be graduating as a MSVU student from a department with both Dr. MacLeod and Dr. MacMillan. M. Lyon responded that it was clear that the strength of the Canadian Studies program owed a great deal to the commitment of Dr. Stanley but the reviewers pointed out that the Department cannot assume it will always have a person so dedicated and willing to take on so much individually and that the program should involve more faculty and be more integrated into the Department.

#### 7.5 Graduate Studies Program and Policy Committee

##### 7.5.1 Calendar description revision re: Failure

##### 7.5.2 Policy on Dismissal and Readmission

**Moved** by K. Kienapple, seconded I. Blum by that Senate approve the calendar description revision re: Failure and the Policy on Dismissal and Readmission **CARRIED**

S. Drain clarified that the motion covered both 7.5.1 and 7.5.2.

M. MacMillan commented that the F\* creates a situation where a student can be readmitted with a charge of academic dishonesty.

S. Drain asked, regarding the policy on page 172 under Policy and Practice – Grade of F\* (second sentence), asked if this meant that only first time serious offences were considered for readmission. K. Kienapple responded that the committee has taken guidance from its review of practices at other institutions.

7.5.3 Application deadlines for 2011/2012

**Moved** by K. Kienapple, seconded by A. MacGillivray that Senate approve the application deadlines for 2011/2012. CARRIED

7.6 Graduate Studies Scholarships, Assistantships and Awards Committee

There was no report.

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

There was no report.

7.8 Information Technology and Services

There was no report.

7.9 Library

There was no report.

7.10 Nominations

There was no report.

7.11 Research and Publications

7.11.1 Conflict of Interest Policy (Research)

**Moved** by F. Harrington, seconded by A. MacGillivray that Senate approve the Conflict of Interest Policy: Guidelines for Researchers at Mount Saint Vincent University. CARRIED

F. Harrington noted that the policy is required to maintain compliance with the Tri-Council.

7.12 Student Experience

There was no report.

7.13 Teaching and Learning (SCOTL)

There was no report.

7.14 Writing Initiatives (WIC)

There was no report.

7.15 Undergraduate Admissions and Scholarships

There was no report.

7.16 University Research Ethics Board

7.16.1 Secondary data analysis guidelines and form (for information)

F. Harrington spoke on the UREB working on their guidelines and forms which have been included in the Senate package for information.

8. Other Reports

8.1 Students' Union

There was no report.

8.2 Board of Governors

There was no report.

8.3 Destination 2012 Implementation

There was no report.

8.4 Joint Board-Senate Liaison

There was no report.

8.5 Administrative Search Committees

There was no report.

9. New business

There was no new business.

10. Items for Communication

Curriculum matters, CAPP Policies, Graduate Studies policies.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cynthia Black