

MOUNT ALLISON UNIVERSITY  
MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

October 10, 2017, 4:00 p.m.  
Tweedie Hall

Present: C. Brett (Secretary), R. Campbell (Chair), S. Camus, A. Cockshutt, G. Crutwell, S. Currie, G. Desmarais, J. Devine, J. Dryden, B. Evans, A. Fancy, N. Farooqi, N. Fry, A. Grant, O. Griffiths, R. Hanakowski, T. Holownia, R. Howlett, A. Irwin, L. Kern, J. Lilburn, W. Lundell, S. MacIver, J. Martinez, D. Mawhinney, K. Meade, M.E. Messinger, L. Michaelis, A. Moreira, K. Morse, A. Nurse, J. Ollerhead (Vice-Chair), C. Parker, E. Patterson, B. Robertson, J. Rogers, V. St. Pierre, K. Stel, E. Steuter, F. Strain, J. Tomes, M. Truitt, N. Verret, N. Vogan, J. Waller, B. Walters, E. Wells, B. White, A. Wilson

Regrets: W. Lundell

Observers: E. Bush, A. Christie, C. Ionescu, L. Snyder, C. VanBeselaere, R. Walker

00.10.10 Acknowledgement of Aboriginal Lands

R. Campbell acknowledged the aboriginal lands and called on Senate to reflect on the knowledge of the aboriginal custodians of the land.

01.10.10 Approval of the Agenda

**Motion (M. Truitt/E. Wells): that Senate adopt the Agenda as circulated**

**Motion Carried**

02.10.10 Approval of the Senate Minutes of September 12, 2017

**Motion (M. Truitt/N. Farooqi): that Senate adopt the Minutes of the meeting of September 12, 2017**

**Motion Carried**

C. Brett read two corrections that senators had made to the circulated minutes. The posted approved minutes contain those corrections.

03.10.10 Business Arising from the Minutes

K. Meade provided an update on student enrollment. The October first-year enrollment number for 2017-18 is 604 students, compared to 641 from 2016-17. Total enrollment for 2017-18 is 2247 undergraduate and 17 graduate students, compared to 2321 and 18, respectively, in 2016-17. She informed senate that the decline in first-year enrollment comes despite a nine percent increase in applications and an 11 percent increase in offers. A survey of students who were given offers but did not come to Mount Allison has been conducted. The results of this survey await analysis.

K. Meade stated that she was due to report to the University Planning Committee on enrollments later in October.

K. Meade invited senators to participate in the University Open House and in a Town Hall discussion on recruitment, scheduled for October 19.

04.10.10 Report from the Chair

R. Campbell expressed his appreciation for what he termed good working relations between Mount Allison University and the Town of Sackville.

The President highlighted some significant events on campus, including those related to the Year of Indigenous Action, the welcoming of the new Artist in Residence, Karen Strang, and the creation of the James Rogers Student-Athlete Award.

R. Campbell notified Senate that the university has received a draft Memorandum of Understanding on funding from the Government of New Brunswick. The university administration and the Board of Regents will consider this proposal and prepare the university's response.

05.10.10 Candidates for Degrees – October Graduation

**Motion (A. Cockshutt/B. Robertson): that Senate move *in camera* for the purpose of considering candidates for degrees**

**Motion Carried**

Senate considered a list of candidates for degrees.

**Motion (A. Cockshutt/O. Griffiths): that Senate move *ex camera***

**Motion Carried**

06.10.10 Fall Convocation

R. Campbell declared Convocation open. As Vice-Chancellor, he then conferred degrees *in absentia* to the candidates whom Senate had approved. Senators congratulated the graduates with a round of applause. R. Campbell then declared Convocation closed.

07.09.13 Report from the University Planning Committee

J. Ollerhead reported on the recent work of the committee, which included collecting feedback on the Academic Plan and starting to think about academic hiring for 2018-19. At upcoming meetings, the committee will consider the Anthropology programs and succession planning for the two Academic Deans who are on one-year appointments.

L. Michaelis asked whether the University Planning Committee would make a recommendation regarding Anthropology before receiving the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Consider the Status and Future of the Anthropology Department and Anthropology Programs at Mount Allison University. J. Ollerhead answered that he will ask the committee about how they wish to proceed.

08.10.10 Report from the Late Granting of Degrees Committee

Senate received the report. C. Brett asked for comments or questions. There were none. The text of the report is as follows.

Late Granting of Degrees Committee  
Report to Senate – October 10, 2017

Committee Members:

The Provost and Vice-President, Academic & Research (Chair) – Dr. Robert Campbell (Acting)

The Secretary of Senate – Dr. Craig Brett  
The Registrar – Ms. Chris Parker

The Late Granting of Degrees Committee met via email correspondence on May 12, 2017 to approve two students for BA with First Class Honours. Both students had been approved by Senate for BA Honours degrees but it was determined that they qualified for First Class Honours after recalculating the Honours GPA on courses included in their prescribed programs.

09.10.10 Report from the Admission and Re-admissions Committee

Senate received the report. E. Wells asked for comments or questions. R. Campbell asked about how the number of cases considered by the committee compared to recent years. E. Wells answered that the number of cases seemed to be normal.

The text of the report is given below.

**Admissions and Re-admissions Committee  
Report to Senate – October 10, 2017**

Committee Members: T. Craig (as of July 1) N. Johnston, C. Lovekin (as of July 1) W. Lundell (to June 30), G. Ouellette (to June 30), K. Stel (R. Howlett from June 30 – Aug 30), E. Wells (Chair) C. Parker (secretary)

The Admissions and Re-admissions Committee met nine times during the period from September, 2016 through August 2017, on the following dates: September 17, 2016 (by email – 1 application), October 21, 2016 (by email – 1 application), December 5, 2016 (by email – 1 application), January 3, 2017 (by email – 1 application), February 27, 2017 (4 applications, EAB proposal), March 22, 2017 (by email – 1 application), June 19, 2017 (7 applications, plus 67 academic standing appeals), August 3, 2017 (by email – 1 application), August 17, 2017 (by email – 1 application)

**Applications for Readmission following a period of Suspension or Dismissal**

From the period of September, 2016 through August 2017, the committee considered eighteen applications including four requesting permission to register for correspondence course while on Probation (one denied permission), and fourteen applying for re-admission following a period of Academic Suspension or Dismissal. In all cases the students were re-admitted on Academic Probation for the term requested.

**Academic Standing Appeals at the end of the 16/SFW year**

The committee considered sixty-seven letters of appeal.

Six students appealing Suspension or Dismissal had an account balance at time of appeal. Calendar regulation 4.4.4 stipulates that appeals to the Admissions and Re-admissions Committee will only be considered if there is no outstanding balance payable on the student's account. The committee considered the appeals but the outcome was not to be released until the account balance was paid. The students were informed of the deadline by which their account balance must be paid in order to appeal the decision of the Admissions and Re-admissions Committee should the outcome not be favourable.

Students recommended by the committee for re-admission on Academic Probation were re-admitted with the condition that they may register for no more than 15 credits per term and that they will remain on Academic Probation until the end of the 2017-2018 academic session at which time their academic standing will be re-assessed. To return to Good Standing they must achieve a Session GPA of at least 1.5 AND a CGPA of at least 1.5. During the probation period, students are not eligible to take courses on Letter of Permission at another university or register for correspondence courses.

Students whose appeals were unsuccessful were advised that the committee's decision may be appealed to the Readmission Appeals Committee under one of the following grounds:

- a) the Admissions and Re-admissions Committee was biased;
- b) the Admissions and Re-admissions Committee made an error in interpreting a regulation;
- c) **new** information has been provided subsequent to the decision of the Admissions and Re-admissions Committee; (eg. Grade change in course(s), medical or other supporting documentation)
- d) the decision of the Admissions and Re-admissions Committee imposes undue or unreasonable hardship.

### **Conditions for Readmission – Support Services**

Effective in June 2016, students whose appeals were successful were re-admitted on probation with a requirement that they sign a 'conditions for re-admission' form whereby they agreed to meet with the student service provider(s) indicated on the form, as determined by the committee, before the end of September. Student service providers included: Meighen Centre, Wellness Centre, Academic Advisor, Program Advisors, Academic Support Services, International Advisor, Indigenous Affairs Coordinator, Financial Aid Counsellor, Director of Athletics.

Of those students who were re-admitted on probation for the 16/SFW session:

- Nine of ten students who met with the support service provider achieved Good Standing
- Four of five students who met with the support service provider ended the year on Academic Probation
- Fourteen of twenty-two students who met with the support service provider ended the year on Academic Suspension; seven of those submitted academic standing appeals, six were successful
- Three of seven students who met with the support service provider ended the year on Dismissal; two of those submitted academic standing appeals, one was successful

### **Group I - Academic Dismissal**

Two of the ten students who ended the year on Academic Dismissal appealed. The committee made no recommendation for re-admission for one student and that student remains on dismissal with the right to appeal the committee's decision. The committee recommended re-admission on probation for the other student.

### **Group II - Academic Suspension from Good Standing**

Twenty-nine of forty-seven students who began the year in Good Standing but ended the year on Academic Suspension appealed. The committee recommended that twenty-six of the students be re-admitted to full-time studies on Academic Probation. The committee made no recommendation for re-admission for three students and those students remain on suspension unless they appeal the committee's decision.

### **Group III - Academic Suspension from Academic Probation or Re-admission on Probation**

Thirty-six of eighty-four students who began the year on Academic Probation (28) or Re-admitted on Probation following a period of suspension (8) appealed their placement on Academic Suspension. The committee recommended thirty-two of those students to be re-admitted to full-time studies on Academic Probation. The committee made no recommendation for re-admission for four students and those students remain on suspension unless they appeal the committee's decision.

## 10.10.10 Report from the Re-admissions Appeals Committee

Senate received the report. C. Brett asked for comments or questions. There were none. The text of the report is as follows.

Re-admissions Appeals Committee  
Report to Senate, October 10 2017

Membership of the Committee:

- The Secretary of Senate (ex officio), Craig Brett, Chair
- An Academic Dean (ex officio), Amanda Cockshutt
- One Faculty Member or Librarian, Zoe Finkel
- One Alternate Faculty Member or Librarian, Geoff Crutwell

The Re-admissions Appeals Committee met once in the past year, on July 17, 2016. It considered four appeals decisions of the Admissions and Re-admissions Committee, all from students who had been placed on Suspension, having previously been re-admitted on probation. Each appellant brought information to the Appeals Committee that was not available to the Admissions and Re-admissions Committee.

The Re-admissions Appeal Committee reversed the decisions of Admissions and Re-admissions Committee in all cases. The four students were re-admitted, subject to conditions. These conditions were tailored to the circumstances of each case, but typically involved mandatory use of support services.

Respectfully Submitted,

Craig Brett  
Secretary of Senate and Committee Chair

#### 11.10.10 Report from the Academic Integrity Committee

Senate received the report. N. Farooqi asked for comments. R. Campbell asked if the number of cases was unusual. N. Farooqi answered that the number was similar to previous years, and that plagiarism remains a significant concern. The committee is looking into education programs on plagiarism.

The text of the report is reproduced below.

Academic Integrity Committee  
*Report to Senate for 2016-17*

**Members:**

Academic Dean delegated by Provost as the Academic Integrity Officer (Chair):

\* Nauman Farooqi

Two faculty or librarians, elected by the Senate:

\* Mark Hamilton (2015-2018)

\* Andrew Nurse (2015-2018)

One alternate faculty or librarian, elected by the Senate:

\*Genevieve Desmarais (2015-2018)

Two students, elected by the Senate:

\* Andrew Moreira

\* Rachel Howlett 2016-17 (current member: Everett Patterson)

One alternate student, elected by the Senate:

\* Alex Lepianka 2016-17 (current member: Nigel Verret)

A total of twenty-eight cases were submitted to the Academic Integrity Officer during the 2016-17 academic year.

\* 21 cases were reported under 10.6.2 (a) dealing with plagiarism

- \* 2 cases were reported under 10.6.2 (b) dealing with submitting work for which academic credit has been received or which was reported for academic credit for another course without the written permission of the instructor (s).
- \* 1 case was reported under 10.6.2 (e) dealing with use of unauthorized aid or assistance in tests or exams.
- \* 1 case reported under 10.6.2 (d) dealing with copying someone else's work on assignments, or exams.
- \* 1 case was reported under 10.6.2 (l) and (m) dealing with submitting false information or false medical documentation or misrepresenting personal circumstances to postpone or gain an advantage for any academic work (l), tampering with academic transcripts or records and or submitting false credentials (m).
- \* 2 cases were reported under 10.6.2 (n) dealing with any other form of misrepresentation, cheating, fraudulent academic behavior or other improper academic conduct of comparable severity.

Sanctions imposed by instructors included:

- \* Reduced grade on assignment/lab
- \* Zero on the assignment/exam
- \* Zero on the paper
- \* Failure in the course
- \* Rewrite for the paper/assignment

Four students were placed on disciplinary probation due to academic misconduct.

With the exception of three cases students acknowledged their academic misconduct. The three exceptions were:

- \* One case was contested by a student under 3.2 (f) of the Academic Integrity Policy. A meeting was organized by the AIO with the student and instructor after which the AIO supported the penalty imposed by the faculty member.
- \* In one case, the student acknowledged their academic misconduct but appealed to the Academic Appeals Committee to contest the severity of the decision (disciplinary suspension). The appeal was denied.
- \* One case under 10.6.2 (n) was dismissed due to lack of evidence.

The committee met three times during the academic year (January 18, April 03 and May 01). The committee reviewed the new policy as well as the feedback received from faculty members concerning the new policy. A minor procedural addition was adopted to the workflow whereby the head of the related department would be informed of the decision of the case. The AIO also consulted the committee on two cases of academic integrity. As majority of cases reported involved plagiarism, the committee discussed the possibility of using a software for educating students.

Respectfully submitted.

Nauman Farooqi  
 Academic Integrity Officer  
 Dated: September 29, 2017

12.10.10 Report from the International Programs Committee

**MOTION (N. Farooqi/ J. Devine): THAT SENATE APPROVE ESTABLISHING AN EXCHANGE PROGRAM PARTNERSHIP WITH PONTIFICIA UNVERSIDAD CATOLICA DE VALPARAISO (CHILE).**

**Motion carried (1 abstention)**

## CONTEXT:

At its last meeting, the International Programs Committee approved an exchange agreement with the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso (PUCV), located in Valparaíso, Chile after positive site-visit reports, careful consideration of the university, and student interest at Mount Allison.

Established in 1928, PUCV serves over 13,300 students. It is a large institution comprised of the following colleges: the College of Architecture and Urban Design, the College of Philosophy and Education, the College of Sciences, the College of Agronomic and Food Sciences, the College of Ocean Sciences and Geography, the College of Engineering, and the College of Economics and Business Administration.

PUCV is our first partner university in Latin America. As an exchange partner, it offers our students a rich cultural experience in Latin America and is a good fit for students with advanced language proficiency in Spanish (B1 level) who can therefore enrol in academic courses in Spanish. Our exchange students at PUCV will take academic courses in any of the colleges listed above alongside Chilean and international students. Students will choose between a homestay option and a residence option. The academic year is structured as follows: 1<sup>st</sup> term = March-July; 2<sup>nd</sup> term = August –December.

PUCV has several other programs available to our students on a fee-paying basis. For example, it offers a semester-long program for students with a beginner level of Spanish who wish to live in Chile, improve their Spanish, and learn about Chilean and Latin American culture through total immersion.

PUCV also offers short-term, intensive language programs prior to the start of each term to allow students to advance their language learning or prepare themselves for their exchange studies in Spanish. Four weeks in length typically, they are offered in January, February, June, and July.

Finally, PUCV has a summer business internship program with an organisation located in Valparaíso – Chrysalis Business Incubator. This program includes a contextualization course, one-on-one meetings with a mentor, and optional academic courses in Spanish. It is available to students with an advanced level of Spanish.

The International Programs Committee determined that it is an excellent fit for Mount Allison and seeks Senate's approval for an exchange program partnership.

R. Campbell asked if this was the first exchange with an institution in Latin America. N. Farooqi answered that it is the first such exchange. A. Christie informed Senate that some other such exchanges are in the works.

13.10.10 Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Fall Study Break

**Motion (K. Stel/A. Moreira): that Senate approve the continuation of a week-long Fall Study Break attached to Remembrance Day**

**Motion Carried (1 nay, 4 abstentions)**

Justification:

- The option of having the Fall Study Break of Fall Study Break in November attached to Remembrance Day was preferred over no Study Break, a Break in October attached to Thanksgiving, and a combination of extra days without classes attached to both Thanksgiving and Remembrance Day. Of the students, 63 percent of students ranked this option first while 37 percent of the faculty ranked this option first.
- The Fall Study Break also helped reduce student and faculty stress. Students reported lower levels of stress after the Break and over 80% indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that the Fall Study Break helped reduce school-related stress levels. For the faculty, 33% indicated that the Fall Study Break generally helped reduce teaching related stress.
- Faculty indicated that the Fall Study Break helped manage workloads. Over 70% of the faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the Fall Study Break helped manage workload.
- The majority of students (47%) did not spend any days on campus during the Fall Study Break although over 18% spent all 5 days of the break on campus.
- When asked to rank order the things that they spent their Break time doing, students ranked catching up on currently assigned work first followed by resting/relaxing/on vacation. The third ranked option was studying for upcoming midterms, seminars, lab prep.
- The majority of faculty (50%) indicated that the Fall Study Break had no effect on their teaching pedagogy.
- When asked for the impact of the Fall Study Break on students' academic performance, over 36% of faculty indicated that there was no change in student performance but another 36% were unsure about the impact.

C. Parker noted that the week-long break will result in there being two weeks of term after the break in Fall 2019, rather than the three we currently have.

**Motion (M. Truitt/E. Wells): that Senate disband, with thanks, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Fall Study Break**

**Motion carried**

14.10.10 Report from the Teaching and Learning Committee

Senate received the report. L. Snyder asked for comments and questions. There were none. The text of the report is given below.

### **Teaching and Learning Committee**

#### ***Report to Senate, October 10, 2017***

Members (2016/2017 Academic Year):

- Eileen Herteis (director, PCTC, ex-officio member)
- Toni Roberts (CSD educational technology Consultant, ex-officio member)
- Andrew Hamilton-Wright (faculty; committee chair: 2014-Dec. 2016)
- Morgan Poteet (faculty: 2014-2017)
- Robert Lapp (faculty: 2016-2019)
- David Fleming (faculty: 2017-2019; joined committee January 2017)
- Laura Snyder (librarian: 2015-2018; committee chair beginning January 2017)
- Tierra Stokes (student: 2016-2017)



- Andrew Moreira (student: 2016-2017)

The Committee met six times during the 2016-2017 academic year. Lively and productive discussion throughout the year focused primarily on the following topics:

**Experiential Learning (EXPL): What is a course? What is a credit?** The Committee discussed the nature of the course and the credit, especially in light of initiatives such as experiential learning, decolonization of the curriculum and institution, and making post-secondary education more accessible. **Intellectual Property (lecture content, syllabi, etc.)** Important questions around this topic include: Who owns such material, the University or the individual professor? What is appropriate use of this material? Who should have access and for what purpose? What protections do professors have? After general discussion by the Committee, a sub-committee (T. Roberts, R. Lapp, T. Stokes) was formed to explore these issues further. A draft Classroom Audio and Video Recording Policy was presented to the committee. Next steps will include consultation with other constituents on campus.

**Accessible Learning.** Discussion of accessibility issues and Universal Design for Learning led to the Committee's co-sponsorship (with PCTC) of a half-day UDL workshop on April 26, 2017. The workshop, led by David Korotkov (St. Thomas University) and Kim Korotkov (Early Education & Childhood Development, New Brunswick), drew 26 participants.

Laura Snyder, Chair

#### 15.10.10 Report from Faculty Council

Senate received the report. G. Crutwell commented on the report, saying that the only unusual item was the report on the Open Houses regarding the Anthropology programs. There were no other questions or comments. The text of the report is given below.

#### **Report for Senate from Faculty Council Oct. 3, 2017**

As per the motion passed at its May meeting, Faculty Council convened two open house-style meetings on the subject of the Anthropology Programme for faculty, students, and staff. The meetings took place on May 25th and Sept. 12th. Both meetings generated important insights about the matter and meeting notes summarizing these exchanges were circulated to members in September.

At its Sept. 28<sup>th</sup> 2017 meeting, the members of Faculty Council discussed a number of subjects after moving to approve the list of October graduands circulated by the Registrar. Other subjects included the adjustment of regulations so that students who are on probation may be allowed to take correspondence courses. N. MacEachern from Facilities Management and R. Inglis then provided an update on space use and the schedule for repairs and building projects on campus. They have promised to craft a 3-5 year plan and will return to Faculty Council in the coming months to discuss this plan.

The next matter discussed was the Academic Plan, circulated prior to the meeting. J. Ollerhead provided an overview of the plan and its genesis. Members expressed a desire to determine what interdisciplinarity

means in the academic plan. J. Ollerhead also provided an update on Explorance and took questions. The meeting concluded with a report from the Chair, who summarized the provincial funding situation.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lauren Beck,  
Secretary, Faculty Council

16.10.10 Continuation of discussion of the regarding the university contract with eXplorance Blue and related concerns from the meeting of Senate, September 12, 2017.

B. White informed Senate that he had asked for this item to be added to the agenda because he thought it was important that the discussion from the September meeting of Senate be continued.

Discussion began with O. Griffith asking J. Ollerhead whether the current paper-based system of conducting student surveys can be used along with or instead of the eXplorance Blue system. J. Ollerhead answered that the paper-based system could not be used because it does not meet the requirements of the Collective Agreement between Mount Allison University and the Mount Allison Faculty Association. O. Griffiths asked several follow-up questions about the specific way(s) in which the paper-based system might contravene the Collective Agreement. J. Ollerhead answered that the reports generated by the current system contain information that, under the provisions of Appendix B to the Collective Agreement, should not be collected. He added that this information cannot be easily removed from the reports.

O. Griffiths concluded by saying that he was astounded that the Provost took this decision without consulting more broadly with, for example, the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee or faculty members at large. B. White added that everyone except faculty, through MAFA, appeared to have been consulted. J. Ollerhead answered that there were meetings with MAFA representatives, but he declined to say more because the issue was (as of October 12) the matter of a grievance between MAFA and the university.

L. Michaelis asked why the Provost insisted that this is a purely technical matter, necessitated by the Collective Agreement. She said that technical matters may impinge upon Senate policy and so discussion at Senate should have gone before a decision. J. Ollerhead answered that he viewed the decision as part of his responsibility, as Provost, to administer Policy 5310. L. Michaelis reminded Senate that administrating a policy is not the same as overriding a policy or setting it aside. J. Lilburn said that, in his view, the proposed online system is at odds with Policy 5310. J. Ollerhead said that he believed that the new system accords with the policy.

L. Michaelis said that she saw a role for the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee in considering the unique challenges posed by online surveys, including low response rates and survey fatigue.

There followed a discussion of the effectiveness of online surveying procedures. B. Robertson and A. Cockshutt spoke of receiving good responses when taking part in a recent pilot study. They both expressed the opinion that online questionnaires are consistent with existing policy. K. Stel spoke in favor of online questionnaires. As a student, she found an online system more convenient and more conducive to providing complete answers. R. Howlett expressed MASU's support for an online system, especially in light of student concerns over the potential for respondents to be identified by their handwriting. M. Messenger, on the other hand, found that she spent too much class time pleading with students to fill out

online surveys. J. Devine asked whether there was data from the online pilot project that could be used to assess these competing claims. J. Ollerhead answered that the responses from the pilot are made available to the instructors of courses, and only to the instructors. Thus, the university has no data set to analyze.

L. Michaelis asked whether faculty could opt for paper-based surveys. In light of the ongoing grievance, J. Ollerhead declined to answer the question.

17.10.10 Other Business

There was no other business.

18.10.10 Adjournment

There being no further business or announcements, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm (E. Wells/ M. Truitt).

Respectfully submitted,

Craig Brett  
Secretary