



Senate Meeting
Rosaria Boardroom

January 30, 2012
7:30 p.m.

MINUTES

Present: R. Lumpkin (Chair), K. Blotnicky, B. Blenkarn, S. Brigham, E. Church, A. Cole, S. Drain, R. Farmer, M. Forrest, C. French, M.J. Harkins, J. Hollett, B. Jessop, N. Kayhani, K. Kienapple, T. Larkin, B. MacInnes, J. MacLeod, G. McGovern, D. McKenna, P. Mombourquette, B. Morse, L. Neilsen, D. Norris, T. Paris, S. Perrott, I. Pottie, C. Schneider, J. Sharpe, L. Steele, B. Taylor, A. Thurlow, S. Walsh, M. Whalen, R. Zuk

Regrets: R. Richards, P. Watts

Guests: K. Gallant

1. Approval of Agenda

Moved by J. MacLeod, seconded by S. Brigham, to approve the agenda with the following changes:

- Amendment of order item 6.4 moved under item 6.1
- Addition of Nominations item 6.6.2 - Correction of appointment date (as distributed).
- Addition of New Business item 8.1 - Senate resolution in support of NSCAD.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of November 28, 2011.

Moved by J. Hollett, seconded J. MacLeod, to approve the minutes of November 28, 2011 as presented. CARRIED

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

- 3.1. Task Force for Revision of the Student Judicial Code and Handbook (J. Hollett)
J. Hollett reported that the policy is currently under legal review.

4. President's Announcements

R. Lumpkin gave an overview of the Memorandum of Understanding with the Provincial Government, including a 3% reduction in funding to universities for 2012-13. She went on to say that universities are being strongly encouraged to find ways to reduce costs, including sharing services and eliminating redundancies. She noted that a \$25 Million dollar incentive fund will be made available over the three year term to support projects designed to reduce university operating costs and achieve sustainability.

In reply to a question from D. McKenna, R. Lumpkin said that the Mount administration would be applying for the innovation funds, and had already participated in a joint application to meet deadline for the first disbursement of five million. She also invited Senators to bring forward any ideas for innovative cost savings.

In reply to a question from M. Forrest, R. Lumpkin stated that the government expected savings initiatives to return their investment dollar for dollar within the lifetime of the agreement.

P. Mombourquette noted that there had been speculation that some of the incentive money could be used towards early retirement plans. R. Lumpkin confirmed this possibility but

noted it would depend on the situation at each university, and that the Mount had had a number of recent retirements. B. Jessop noted the allocation for this purpose is not large.

In reply to a question from M. Forrest, R. Lumpkin reported that there had been no talk of a fixed (uniform) tuition across the province.

R. Lumpkin noted that South West Properties would give an overview of their plan to develop the Motherhouse property and answer questions regarding the development, at the next Town Hall meeting to be held on Feb. 29th, 2012 at 10:30 AM.

R. Lumpkin concluded by inviting all Senators to the February 9th, 2012 announcement of Project 2012.

5. Question Period

R. Farmer questioned how well the National Day of Action had been communicated. R. Lumpkin noted that a campus wide bulletin had just been distributed.

D. McKenna confirmed that a notice was also sent in November and early December.

R. Farmer responded by saying a part-time member had not received any notification.

D. McKenna responded that the Student Union had hoped to make everyone aware, but understood that some part-time faculty were missed. R. Lumpkin suggested that this type of item be listed under Senate's 'Items for Communication' in the future.

R. Farmer noted that this type of item should be redistributed to part-time faculty in January, as not all part-time faculty teach both the fall and winter terms.

M. Forrest expressed some concern over the new Exam Policy.

E. Church acknowledged that some bumps did exist with the implementation of the new exam policy. She noted that the main issue brought forward by faculty was not having enough time to prepare and submit their exams (that is exams scheduled within the first five days). Going forward the Registrar's office will note on their initial memo for faculty to contact their Dean to make accommodations to resolve this issue if needed.

In reply to a question from R. Zuk, E. Church noted that she was aware of one incident when an exam was not in the examination room. B. MacInnes noted that the exam in question had been submitted late. The Registrar's Office has put procedures in place to ensure that, in the future, exams are available in the examination room. In reply to a question by S. Perrott, B. MacInnes reported that she believed the program could send an acknowledgement email to confirm submission of an exam; she will confirm.

K. Blotnick asked whether the new Course Outline Policy had made a positive difference in course outlines, and asked whether distribution via moodle is sufficient.

K. Kienapple responded that his chairs reported that the new procedure had been effective in improving consistency and eliminating some questionable requirements for course outlines, and added that such improvements would be of benefit to students.

C. French agreed with K. Kienapple's comments particularly regarding consistency, and noted that there was greater sharing of course outlines within her department as a result. She did note, however, that there was an increase in last-minute workload in reviewing submitted outlines.

L. Steele agreed that there were benefits, but noted workload concerns.

J. MacLeod noted that if chairs are only supposed to confirm that course outlines include the necessary language, the situation may have improved. However, he expressed some concern with asking Chairs to evaluate the content of course outlines, especially in the light of academic freedom provisions in the collective agreement.

M. Forrest underlined these concerns, and noted that it appears that staff have sometimes been asked to review the course outlines.

E. Church clarified that chairs are not asked to comment on the content.

P. Mombourquette noted that departments like his had a very large number of outlines, as many as 75, to review. He wondered if course outlines could be shortened by including only a link to a website stating the university regulations. D. McKenna commented that it was unlikely that students would follow such a link.

E. Church commented that if Senators wanted to discuss the course outline policy further it should be brought back to Senate formally. She reminded senators that the policy had been discussed extensively at both CAPP and Senate before being approved.

R. Lumpkin summarized faculty concerns with workload, the length of course outlines, and the matter of electronic or print distribution of outlines. She asked Senators to contact the Secretary of Senate if they would like to see the course outline policy on the Senate agenda.

6. Committee Reports (Standing and Ad Hoc)

6.1. Senate Executive

6.1.1. Policy on Policies and Policy Template

Moved C. Schneider, seconded by K. Blotnicky, that Senate approve the Senate Policy on Policies and Policy Template (EX-2012-01) for use by Senate Committees. CARRIED.

L. Steele brought forward a friendly amendment asking that procedure number 4 be changed from 'submitted in WORD' to 'submitted in an editable digital format'. The amendment was accepted.

A. Cole questioned whether if it was always appropriate to have policy and procedures together under a policy document.

In the discussion that ensued, the point was made that the purpose of the policy document is to help clarify the distinction between policies and procedures; the policy allows for policies to come forward, if appropriate, without procedures, and for procedures to be brought forward without a governing policy.

6.1.2. Revisions to the Rules of Order of Senate

Moved by C. Schneider, seconded by S. Brigham, that Senate approved the Rules of Order as amended. CARRIED

In reply to a question from M. Forrest, S. Drain explained the rationale behind the change in permission to consult confidential material.

6.1.3. Distribution of Senate Materials

R. Lumpkin spoke to Senators regarding the distribution of Senate meeting materials. She proposed that each year Senators would be polled to determine those who would like to receive documentation electronically and those who would like to continue to receive paper copies. She noted that this choice would be revocable if required.

S. Drain added that there would be a cost and time savings in moving towards electronic copies, especially if Senate documents are submitted to the Senate Office in electronic format. She noted, however, that confidential materials would remain in hard copy. She noted that the Board of Governors has gone paperless, using tablets, laptops and monitors to view documents at the meetings.

R. Lumpkin commented that this maneuver was not meant to download printing costs to Senators or their departments.

The committee had a brief discussion regarding the issue.

M. Forrest added that consideration had to be given to those individuals with special needs.

R. Lumpkin noted that S. Drain would poll Senators before the next meeting to note their preference.

6.1.4. Senate Discussion of the Strategic Plan

R. Lumpkin inquired if Senators would be open to an extra meeting of Senate for the discussion of the strategic plan or whether they would prefer to take an hour of a scheduled meeting for the purpose. In response to several Senators' statements, R.

Lumpkin agreed to review the agendas of March 5th and 26th with the Senate Secretary to decide which could incorporate an extended discussion.

6.2. Academic Policy and Planning

6.2.1. Proposed Changes to the Senate-approved Timeslots

Item removed from the agenda

R. Zuk asked for a presentation of student schedule models when this item returns to Senate.

E. Church thanked R. Zuk for her suggestion that student schedule models be included in the next proposal. She noted that this item was being withdrawn pending further consultation.

6.2.2. Senate Policies to be rescinded

Moved by E. Church, seconded by L. Neilsen, that Senate rescind the policies outlined on page 30 of the supporting materials. CARRIED.

[List of rescinded policies]

1. Convocation – Fall Scheduling (approved at Senate September 27, 1993)
2. CO-OP (approved at Senate April 24, 1978)
3. DUET (approved at Senate April 26, 1982)
4. Official Languages Study (approved at Senate February 7, 1986)
5. Jeanne Sauvé Chair (approved at Senate January 25, 1988)
6. Women in Engineering in Affiliation with TUNS (approved at Senate February 25, 1995)
7. Open Learning (approved at Senate February 28, 1994)
8. MSVU/NSCAD Cooperative Visual B.Ed. Program (approved at Senate April 25, 1995)
9. MVSU/SMU Departments of History Partnership Agreement (approved at Senate February 25, 1995)]

6.2.3. Change of date for Fall Convocation effective 2013

Moved by E. Church, seconded by M. Forrest, that the date of fall convocation change from the second Sunday of November to the first Sunday of November. CARRIED
In response to a question from M. Forrest, B. MacInnes noted that the change would not affect those submitting graduate theses.

6.2.4. Change of date for Fall Convocation 2012

Moved by E. Church, seconded by B. Jessop, that Senate approve a change in the date for the 2012 fall convocation from November 18 to October 28. CARRIED

E. Church gave the rationale for the change.

This item was originally presented to Senate as “an item for information”; however, after some discussion it was agreed, since the change overrides the current rules for the date, that a motion was in order.

6.2.5. Report on the MPHEC Monitoring Process

E. Church reported that the Policy and Procedures for the External Review of Programs, approved by Senate in February 2011, had been very positively received by MPHEC.

6.3. Graduate Studies Program and Policy (for information)

6.3.1. Deletion of a prerequisite for GEPY 6606 Values Reasoning

K. Kienapple reviewed the document.

6.4. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure or Permanence for Academic Administrators

6.4.1. Nomination for Professor Emerita (**in camera**)

Moved by S. Perrott, seconded by B. Jessop, to move *in camera*. CARRIED

Nomination for Professor Emerita (Confidential Business)
One candidate was presented. **Vote by Secret Ballot.**

Moved by J. MacLeod, seconded by G. McGovern, to move from *in camera*. CARRIED

Moved by D. McKenna, seconded by L. Steele, to move *in camera*. CARRIED

Nomination for Professor Emerita (Confidential Business) **Vote result announced.**

Moved by D. McKenna, seconded by K. Kienapple, to move from *in camera*. CARRIED

6.5. Information Technology and Services

6.5.1. Motion regarding WiFi improvement

Moved by D. McKenna on behalf of SCOITS, seconded by B. Jessop, that Senate endorse the use of strategic investment funds for better and more accessible Wi-Fi on campus.

B. Jessop noted that though WiFi has been improved on campus, there has been an exponential growth in demand for connections.

In response to a question from R. Zuk, R. Lumpkin noted that Senate cannot vote on monetary matters but that it can encourage the spending of money in particular directions.

J. MacLeod expressed a concern that Senate was being asked to recommend spending without any data. B. Taylor reminded Senators that a similar recommendation had been passed by Senate regarding spending on Library acquisitions.

A friendly amendment was proposed and accepted.

Moved by D. McKenna, seconded by B. Jessop, that Senate recommend more accessible WiFi on campus. CARRIED - 2 opposed, 4 abstentions

R. Lumpkin acknowledged that some of the discussion touched on the acceptable use of electronic devices in the classroom and asked that SCOITS or SCOTL continue the discussion.

N. Kayhani noted some faculty concerns with outdated software; R. Lumpkin encouraged the referral of such issues to SCOITS.

6.6. Nominations

6.6.1. Nominations to Standing Committees

S. Drain brought forward a replacement memo for 6.6.1

Moved by S. Perrott, seconded by M. Whalen, that Senate elect the following slate of members to the respective committees for the indicated terms. CARRIED

| Committee | Nominee | Term Begins | Term Ends |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Library Committee | Dr. Ian Pottie | When elected | June 30, 2014 |
| Graduate Scholarships, Assistantships and Awards | Dr. Theresa Glanville | When elected | June 30, 2014 |
| Committee on Information Technology & Services | Prof. Brent King | When elected | June 30, 2014 |

6.6.2. Oversight correction

Moved by M. Forrest, seconded by L. Steele, that Senate accept the correction noted in agenda item 6.6.2. CARRIED

6.7. Teaching and Learning

E. Church reported that progress is being made on the Teaching and Learning Plan.

6.8 Writing Initiatives

S. Drain mentioned the upcoming WIC event “Can the use of Social Media improve Students’ Writing?” to be held on February 2nd at 12 noon.

7. Other Reports

7.1. Students' Union

D. McKenna reported that the day of action would take place on Wednesday, February 1, 2012, and that the Union was endeavouring to assist students in forming car pools in the event of a transit strike.

D. McKenna noted the following highlights of student activities: the Jimmy Rankin concert; the Diversity Centre "body project"; grad photos; the Fountain Play Centre Kids Carnival; the Environmental Project in March; the Relay For Life; wrap of the Student Union Information Fair; Winter Term 'Frost' week; Mr. Mount; the upcoming International Education Week and Chinese New Year celebration; the Mount Cup. He also noted Athletics success: Men's Basketball is #1, Women's Volleyball #1, Women's Basketball #2, in their respective divisions. Housing is recruiting new RA's for 2012-12. He thanked the Business Department for its support of Caritas Day initiative, and concluded with praise for the new marketing campaign.

7.2. Destination 2012 (for information)

R. Lumpkin reviewed the mandate of the Strategic plan's Terms of reference and outlined the process of drafting a new version of the Strategic Plan.

8. New Business

8.1 A resolution in support of NSCAD.

Moved by M. Forrest, seconded by R. Zuk, that the Mount Saint Vincent University Senate support in principle the continued distinctiveness and autonomy of our sister institution the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design. CARRIED - 2 abstentions.

9. Items for Communication

- Minutes of November 28, 2011 to be posted to the web
- Policy on Policy and Policy Template
- Revision to Senate Rules of Order
- Poll of Senators regarding the distribution of Senate
- Policies rescinded
- Change of date fall convocation for 2012
- Change of date fall convocation from 2012 forward
- Deletion of a prerequisite for GEPY 6606
- Motion to recommend the expansion of WIFI
- Nominations to Standing Committees
- Terms of Reference for the Strategic Plan Working Committee
- Motion in support of NSCAD

10. Adjournment

Moved by J. MacLeod, seconded by S. Brigham, that the meeting be adjourned.