MOUNT ALLISON UNIVERSITY
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

September 29, 2025, 4:00 pm
Tweedie Hall & Microsoft Teams (hybrid format)

Present: F. Antonelli, L. Beck, A. Beverley, F. Black, Y. Bourgeois, C. Brett, G. Brooks, P. Brown, E. Doukas, D. Fleming, C. Forstall, M. Grant, M. Hamilton, A. Horwood, R. Inglis, R. Isnor, B. Jewett, K. Johnston, L. Keliher, H. Lane, C. Langlais, M. LaPointe, C. MacDougall, T. MacNeil, C. McLaughlin, V. Meli, K. Morse, R. Moser, C. Pringle-Carver, N. Robinson, J. Ropson, T. Reiffenstein, S. Ruckenstein, R. Rubin, R. Schellenberg, I. Sutherland, D. Thomas, J. Tomes, V. St. Pierre

Guests: S. DeWolfe, B. Clayton, T. Hage Coburn, A.-K. Dionne, B. Huffington, N. Lesser, A. Morash, J. Mullen, C. Pomare, L. Reid, L. Ricker, T. Roberts, C. Rodriguez, G. Sandala, E. Sanford, T. Warren, L. Yarmoshuk

Regrets: B. Annear, L. Schwartz,

01.09.16 Territorial Acknowledgement

I. Sutherland read the official territorial acknowledgment written by Elders and the Indigenous Advisory Circle as follows:

> We would like to acknowledge that we are located within the territory of Mi'kma'ki, the unceded, ancestral territory of the Mi'kmaq. Our relationship and our privilege to live on this territory was agreed upon in the Peace and Friendship Treaties of 1752. Because of this treaty relationship it is to be acknowledged that we are all Treaty people and have a responsibility to respect this territory.

02.09.16 Election of Secretary *pro tem*

Motion (V. St. Pierre/M. Hamilton): that Senate elect a Secretary *pro tem*.

Motion carried

L. Beck was elected Secretary *pro tem*.

03.09.16 Presentation of MtA Strategic Plan

I. Sutherland shared some reflections he has had about the strategic plan process and apologized to senate for not doing a good job building trust with senate and vice versa. The entire SP committee met since the last meeting of senate to undertake the revisions around AI and articulating approaches for collaborative implementation, as well as specifying that there will be checkpoints as well as an implementation team to lead the process of implementing the strategic plan in the coming months. Ian acknowledges being defensive and frustrated and apologies to senate, reiterating his confidence in the strategic planning consultation process and asking the university to use this opportunity to come together as a community for the good of this institution's collective future.

C. Brett and R. Rubin presented the revisions to the SP: The revisions focused on clarity as well as specific attention to the comments from Senate on Sept. 16. Revisions included revising language relating to AI, increasing emphasis on Indigenization, Reconciliation, and Decolonization, and adding a section on implementation strategies that foment accountability and transparency.

F. Black: Requests further clarification on the reciprocity of relationships within the community, for instance with the diverse groups that comprise Tantramar, and sent revised language to C. Brett for the SP Committee's consideration, which was also shared orally with senators.

C. McLaughlin: Concerned that broader ranges of pedagogical approaches and supports might not come across in the present version of the SP. C. Brett promised to take a look at it to ensure that this is not lost.

C. Brett: Asked senators whether the most requested revisions to wording around AI reflect senators' viewpoints. C. Forstall expressed his faith in the revision process and moving forward with the proposed plan. C. McLaughlin added that AI was a particular concern among the SP writing team. R. Moser thanked the committee for their efforts and added that the new language now ensures greater boundaries as well as individual flexibility around expectations governing how AI may or may not be used in teaching, learning, research, and administrative activities. M. Hamilton commented that he also finds the revised language for the most part satisfactory. K. Morse clarified that AI is not the goal but rather one of many strategies for supporting our community, and this comes across better in the revised SP. S. DeWolfe inquired if the SP has been examined for Indigenous perspectives and responses to it, particularly its relevance to Indigenous students' learning needs; R. Rubin confirmed that the committee had the participation of an Indigenous student but otherwise no strategic engagement with Indigenous groups. C. MacDougall inquired if the latest version has sufficient guidance for implementation, as there seems to be conflicts between the vision and the implementation goals (i.e., changes to parking on campus). C. Brett noted that the committee had no starting points or markers for identifying priority areas and that the consultation process had an important role in shaping the present version of the SP. F. Black emphasized that trust is a fundamental issue in negotiating this SP and will be a key concern during the implementation phase; she also requested Indigenous engagement with the SP, which the co-leads agreed to undertake. R. Rubin expressed her confidence that the SP provides structure that will enfranchise more people, needs, and perspectives and collaboration during the implementation phase. K. Morse echoed concerns about the SP's breadth. M. Hamilton asked how the SP informs practical decision making. Rachel acknowledged this approach to forming a SP has not been taken before and it was deliberately crafted to be a higher-level plan with flexibility built into it. C. Brett added that "complimentarily" to what we already do is a deliberate constraint on the SP's objectives and implementation so to keep the university grounded in its core identity and values. C. McLaughlin suggested voting on the SP's implementation over the course of time so that senate can maintain its involvement throughout. T. MacNeil asked if the SP's breadth might result in an unequal benefit to stakeholders over time, to which I. Sutherland assured that this is an important area to monitor and the flexibility of the SP should allow benefits to be shared broadly as well. K. Johnston praised the committee's revisions but still feels the process is rushed and that different forms of engagement remain wanting (for example, discuss it at Faculty Council). V. Meli believes the revised version is quite improved, although considers the points raised today valuable steps to take to establish trust and produce the best result, and she inquired how community feedback will be collected; Ian assured senators that everybody would be consulted and the reporting would be transparently shared and that adjustments would be brought to senate for approval as needed. F. Black asked to amend the motion to include Indigenous consultation. C. MacDougall requested whether we can slow down this process to onboard today's feedback before senate votes on the new plan. K. Morse pointed out Senate is just one of several groups to approve the SP. F. Black expressed support for moving forward with addressing issues raised today primarily at the implementation stage. M. Hamilton clarified that Indigenous people had looked at different aspects of this plan during its formative stage and proposes voting on the revised plan at a later date after an Indigenous faculty member is consulted on the revised SP. Ian affirmed it's a good idea to get this final consultation. V. St. Pierre suggested we do not put a timeline on this so that this last consultation can take place and then the motion can be made for Senate to support. G. Sandala inquired about the Indigenous student on the SP committee and Ian confirmed this representation was part of the committee.

Motion (C. Brett/R. Rubin): that Senate to approve the revised Strategic Plan.

Motion tabled, as a result of motion below

F. Black requested tabling the motion until consultation with Indigenous stakeholders is undertaken. An indigenous student senate identified himself as a member of senate, which clarified some members' concerns.

Motion (V. St Pierre/F. Black): That the motion to approve the Strategic Plan be tabled and that hat we send the revised Strategic Plan back to the SPFT with comments and suggested changes and ask them to undertake the consultation as appropriate.

Motion to table carried

04.09.16 Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Lauren Beck
Secretary