Office of the Senate Secretariat

Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia
Canada B0P 1X0

Telephone: (902) 585-1617
Facsimile: (902) 585-1078

ACADIA
UNIVERSITY

Dear Member of Senate:

I advise you that a meeting of the Senate of Acadia University will occur at 4:00 pm on Monday, 12 March 2012 in BAC 132.

The agenda follows:

1) Approval of Agenda

2) Minutes of the Meeting of 13 February 2012

3) Announcements

4) Brought Forward from 13 February 2012

   a) Discussion of Town Hall Data presented by Vice-President Academic

   b) Mid-term Report of Curriculum Committee *(attached; finish discussion of recommendation #4)*

   c) Report from the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (*verbal*)

   d) Review Functioning of Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee (*attached - contains two associated recommendations*)

5) New Business

   a) Nominating Committee Report - Nominations for Professional Studies Representative on the By-Laws Committee (*verbal*)

   b) Curriculum Changes (*attached*)

   c) Awards Committee for Honorary Degrees and Emeriti Distinction - Emeriti Nominations (*information to be provided*)

   d) Committee on Graduate Studies Report to Senate on Graduate Student Supervision (*attached - contains one associated motion*)

   e) Notice of Motion from the Honours Committee (*attached*)

   f) Preliminary Report of the Senate Research Committee on the Upcoming Community and Industry Research Collaboration Day (*attached*)

   g) Process for Reviewing the Strategic Research Plan (*attached*)

5) New Business - Continued

   h) Report from the Honours Committee (*attached*)

   i) Report from the By-Laws Committee (*attached*)

   j) Senate Committee Annual Reports (*attached*)
      i.   Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning (2011-2012)
      ii. Report from the Faculty Development Committee (2010-2011)

   k) Motion from Dr. Vlad Zamlynny, Associate Professor, Chemistry regarding Form3: Proposed Modification to an Existing Course (*attached*)

6) Other Business

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED
Rosemary Jotcham
Registrar and Secretary of Senate

SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MID-TERM REPORT
FEBRUARY 13, 2012

Membership
May Abou Zahra (FA, attended the first meeting); Emma Cochrane (student representative);
Leo Elshof (FPS); Rosemary Jotcham (Registrar); Chris Killacky (ADC); David McMullin
(FPAS); Anne Quéma (FA); Rob Raeside (FPAS); Roxanne Seaman (FPS); Ann Smith
(Library); Sarah Sweet (student representative for Kyle Power).

Mandate
The SCC reviewed curriculum submissions from the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies,
and Pure and Applied Science. For the benefit of new and returning members of the
Committee, the first meeting began with a review of the mandate of the Committee as
stipulated by Senate's Constitution. The mandate of the Committee is to recommend
curriculum proposals for approval at Senate. In preparing these recommendations, the
Committee members ensure that coherence and clarity are maintained while programs and
courses are modified.

Process, comments, context, and issues
Generally, the SCC consulted with several schools and departments to address minor problems
such as the need to clarify the terms of curriculum proposals, or the need to meet the 60 word
requirement for course descriptions. In all cases, the objectives are to ensure that students have
access to clear and accurate information, and that programs maintain descriptive coherence.

Comment # 1: While it is not the Committee's mandate, let alone power, to make economic
recommendations, the Committee's members wish to note that, in some cases, modifications
were made to the curriculum in response to faculty reduction and / or resource reduction.

Comment # 2: With regard to interdisciplinary minors in BSc and BScH, Emma Cochrane and
the Committee note that some courses in the interdisciplinary minors require extensive
prerequisites. Students need to be advised on this matter.

Comment # 3: The SCC has modified language in question 18.c in curriculum forms 1 and 3
so as to replace the reference to "library staff" with "liaison librarian for the program."

A major issue concerns the decision of the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science to modify its
language requirement. The proposal is to replace the required "6 h English or one language
other than English" with "6h from the Faculty of Arts selected from the courses with a
significant writing component as listed at www.science.acadiau.ca/sigwrtingcourseslist or 6 h
of a single language other than English." The SCC invited Peter Williams, Patricia Rigg, Barry
Moody, and Romira Worvill to a meeting where the proposal could be debated and clarified.
To sum up, P. Williams described the consultation process in the FPAS that led to the
formulation of the proposed change, and stated that the chief objectives are to ensure that
Science students develop significant reading and writing skills, and that they have access to a
variety of courses suiting their interests.

These include English courses, language courses, but also other Arts courses with a significant writing component. B. Moody argued that the practical rationale for making this change is to address the backlog of students who need to fulfill this requirement. P. Rigg and R. Worvill underlined the benefits that students derive from taking English and Languages courses (out of 24 students currently majoring in German, 7 are taking double majors in science). P. Rigg noted that first-year courses in English are capped for pedagogical reasons.

Recommendations

The SCC recommends approval of the following motions:

1. That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Arts (attached) be approved.

2. That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Professional Studies (attached) be approved.

3. That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences (attached) be approved.

Furthermore, the SCC recommends that:

4. in the event of major interfaculty as well as interdisciplinary curriculum changes or innovations, a mechanism and structure be established that will ensure that proper consultation takes place among Faculties.

Rationale: While the SCC recommends the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science's curriculum change for Senate's approval, its members are concerned that incomplete communication took place between the FPAS and the FA before the change to the language requirement was submitted to the SCC. It is also the view of the members of the Committee that the SCC is not currently mandated to monitor major interfaculty curriculum changes. The problem is as follows: in the case of curriculum changes affecting two programs, the SCC routinely invite members of the schools and departments concerned to discuss the proposals. However, in the case of major changes affecting two or more faculties, the SCC is not in a position to decide who should be selected to discuss an interfaculty curriculum change.

Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee

Annual Report for 2011-2012

Committee Members 2011-2012

Darren Kruisselbrink, Non-voting Chair

Zelda Abramson, Faculty of Arts representative

Rene Murphy, Faculty of Professional Studies representative

Holger Teismann, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science representative

Barry Moody, Acting Dean of Arts (replaced Robert Perrins, Dean of Arts) *ex officio*

Heather Hemming, Dean of Professional Studies, *ex officio*

Peter Williams, Dean of Pure and Applied Science, *ex officio*

Summary of Activities

The committee met in person on three occasions, Sept. 30, Oct. 26 and Feb. 1. At its Oct 26 and Feb 1 meeting, the committee discussed several policy issues and made several changes or clarifications to its procedures. Specifically:

(a) In the more than a year since its December 2010 Re-ranking report to Senate, the committee has been provided with no clarity regarding the issue of program viability. At that time it was suggested that "a committee be formed to consider program issues across the university (e.g., what existing programs, if any, should be phased out and how; what new programs, if any should be developed)." Although issues of program viability have become more acute over the past year, the committee continues to rank tenure-track position needs in the absence of a coherent strategic context. Furthermore, the criteria and procedures guiding the committee's work fundamentally perpetuate the status quo without regard for the value of a status quo model for the university. This issue was brought to the Senate Executive at its Nov 28 meeting where advice was sought regarding how a larger framework of academic priorities/values might be created to provide a strategic context in which the committee could work. Senate would be well served by outlining a framework of academic priorities for the university for the short and medium term.

(b) Another outstanding issue discussed by the committee has been the academic nature of deliberations in 2011-12. From the preparation of relevant data by the Registrar's Office, to the generation of submissions by units, to the ranking of submissions within Faculties, to the merging of ranked lists at the TTTCAC, the volume of time and energy directed to a process that ostensibly produced no return has been trying. The committee feels that, in the absence of any follow-up action, this time and energy could be much more productively spent on other pursuits. Therefore, the committee recommends to Senate that the TTTCAC shall initiate the ranking process only if the Vice-President Academic has notified the Chair of the TTTCAC, by late May of a given year, that tenure-track searches will be authorized.

(c) Notwithstanding the aforementioned, the committee considered several procedural issues. The document containing a detailed explanation of the data to be considered by the TTTCAC was merged with the TTTCAC Procedures, Criteria and Timelines document so that information relevant to the functioning of the committee would be contained in a single document (see attached).

(d) The TTTCAC Procedures, Criteria and Timelines document was indexed to more easily identify the location of procedural items within the document.

(e) A timeline of September 15 was formally established as the date by which the TTTCAC will have completed its initial fall ranking. This hard date was formalized to enable units to begin advertising authorized tenure-track positions by Oct. 1.

(f) A mechanism for considering trans-disciplinary submissions was outlined (Section 1.7). Briefly, the units involved will prepare a joint submission. The faculty of each unit involved will rank the joint submission within their overall ranking. At the TTTCAC, when the trans-faculty application appears at the top of the list for a faculty, it will remain on the table for that faculty and will be automatically removed from the ranked lists of the other faculties involved.

Recommendations

The TTTCAC recommends that:

1. The committee shall initiate the ranking process only if the Vice-President Academic has notified the Chair of the TTTCAC, by late May of a given year, that tenure-track searches will be authorized;

2. Senate outline a value based framework of academic priorities for the university for the short and medium term;

Looking ahead, the committee has plans to meet in mid-May to discuss its mandate and criteria. I thank the committee members for their time, dedication and thought provoking discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Darren Kruisselbrink, Non-Voting Chair

Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee (TTTCAC)
Procedures, Criteria, and Timelines

February 2012

1. **General Overview**

   1.1. The basic student data for each year of the most recent ten-year period available will be generated by the Registrar's Office. The Chair of the TTTCAC will generate a spreadsheet showing five-year average scores, for all units and Faculties.

   1.2. All units will be provided with these data from the Committee, to ensure consistency. Units will also be provided with a copy of the TTTCAC Procedures, Criteria and Timelines document, outlining the most recent procedures, criteria, and timelines, as presented to Senate.

   1.3. Units will then develop a two-page document (single-spaced, in a reasonable font size) outlining their rationale for requesting either a replacement or a new position.

   1.4. Units must also prepare a Unit Complement Report, identifying all their available teaching personnel, and explaining any variations from standard teaching loads for each person. This Report must be accompanied by a BYDISC2 report, generated by Eden. The two-page document does not need to repeat data from the Registrar's Office or the Unit Complement Report (the Committee will have access to those data), although this information may certainly be referred to.

   1.5. Units will then submit their two-page document (along with the Unit Complement Report and the BYDISC2 report) to their Faculty for ranking.

   1.6. Submissions within a Faculty will be ranked by the relevant body within each Faculty, and each faculty's ranked list, along with the accompanying unit submissions, will be considered by the Committee.

   1.7. Trans-faculty submissions

       1.7.1. The units involved will jointly prepare a submission
       1.7.2. Each of the faculties involved will consider and rank that submission within their overall ranking
       1.7.3. The TTTCAC will follow its usual process of merging the ranked faculty lists. When the trans-faculty application comes to the top of the list for a faculty, it will remain on the table for that faculty and will be automatically removed from the ranked lists of the other faculties.

2. **Timelines**

2.1. Late May/early June: The Committee will forward the data generated by the Registrar's Office, the five-year average figures compiled by the Chair, and a copy of this document outlining the relevant procedures and criteria, to all units.

2.2. September 1: Faculties must complete their preparation of unit submissions, and Faculty ranking procedures over the summer, and the Chair must receive them by September 1.

2.3. September 15: The Committee will meet on or before September 15 to prepare the initial annual master ranked list. The Committee respectfully recommends that all parties involved be prepared to proceed with preparation of job ads, required approvals, etc., in a timely fashion, so that positions are ready to be advertised by October 1 of each year.

2.4. At the September meeting, the Committee will consider

2.4.1.   (a) requests for new positions,

2.4.2.   (b) requests for replacements for currently unfilled positions, and

2.4.3.   (c) requests for replacements for anticipated future vacancies.

2.5. Up to two additional meetings will be held, if necessary, in late October and in mid-December, to deal with any additional submissions arising from late notice of resignations or retirements. Positions arising from resignations or retirements announced after December 15 will be considered in the following year's rankings.

2.6. The Committee will evaluate its current policies, procedures, criteria, and timelines each year, and make any necessary adjustments. These changes will be presented at the January meeting of Senate as part of its annual review of the functioning of the Committee.

3. **Committee Procedures**

3.1. Quorum shall be all six voting members of the committee.

3.2. Every effort shall be made to schedule meetings that all committee members can attend. However, in the event a committee member is unable to attend a meeting in a reasonable period of time, due to illness or travel, an alternate from the same Faculty, elected by the Faculty, shall replace that committee member. To prepare for this eventuality, alternate committee members shall attend the meeting(s) in which the Faculty ranks their positions.

3.3. Committee members need not recuse themselves when a position from their own unit is being considered.

3.4. Initial Annual Rankings

3.4.1. The Committee shall be provided with the list of positions that are required to be converted to tenure stream by the Vice President, Academic's office as per Article 10.09.1.

3.4.2. Positions that have been previously authorized will remain so unless the relevant Faculty requests otherwise.

3.4.3. The Committee may not alter the order of ranking as determined by a Faculty – i.e. if a Faculty is assigned N positions, they must go to the top N positions in the list provided by that Faculty.

3.4.4. At each round of voting, the top unassigned position from each Faculty will be considered.

3.4.5. Prior to each round of voting, a representative from each Faculty, normally the Dean, will speak to the rationale for the position being considered. Following these presentations the floor will be opened for questions and discussion.

3.4.6. Voting in the Committee shall be by open ballot. Each committee member will record their 1st, 2nd and 3rd choice on a ballot to be retained by the Chair. Each 1st choice will be assigned 1 point, each 2nd choice will be assigned 2 points, and each 3rd choice will be assigned 3 points. The position receiving the fewest points will go onto the master list and will be replaced in the next round by the next highest ranked request from the same faculty. I.e., in the first round the Committee would vote on the top-ranked positions from each Faculty. If, after that round, the position from Faculty A received the most votes, in the next round, the Committee would vote on the top ranked positions from Faculty B and C and the second ranked position from Faculty A. If, at any point, only two Faculties remain, members will record their 1st choice and 2nd choice.

3.4.7. In the case of a tie, further discussion and a tie-breaking vote will be held. Positions that remain tied after two rounds of voting will be considered deadlocked and will both occupy the same rank.

3.5. Re- Ranking Due to Late Position Openings

3.5.1. Positions already granted permission to be advertised in the initial annual ranking procedures will be set aside as List A; they will proceed to be advertised, and will not be involved in any re-ranking procedures. The remainder of the list will form List B.

3.5.2. Units that experienced late resignations will be given an opportunity to prepare 2-page submissions advocating for a replacement position. To ensure equity/comparability, the official data these units will use, and the data primarily considered by the Committee, will be the same as that circulated and used for the initial annual rankings. However, if the units wish to mention any other data in their two-page submission, they are free to do so.

3.5.3. Given that new vacancies may alter existing dynamics within a department, units that experienced late resignations may also, if desired, revise their 2-page submissions for other positions already contained within List B. However, units that did not experience late resignations will not revise their existing submissions.

3.5.4. Faculties that experienced late resignations will prepare a new revised Faculty ranking, containing both new vacancies and previously-ranked positions from List B. In this revised Faculty ranking, the new positions, plus any other positions in units that experienced late resignations, may appear in any order. However, the relative rank order of any units that did not experience late resignations must remain exactly the same as in List B.

3.5.5. The first position(s) on the revised list(s) from any Faculty or Faculties that experienced late resignations will then compete for positions against the remaining positions in List B, in order. In cases where previously-ranked positions from two or more Faculties are competing against each other, the relative rank order of those positions from the initial ranking will hold, unless something about the applications has changed (e.g., one of the units has experienced a late resignation). Otherwise, voting proceeds exactly as specified in the existing Committee Procedures for the initial annual ranking.

3.5.6. Note that no changes in the relative ranking of positions within Faculties that did not experience a late resignation can occur. Positions from Faculties that experienced late resignations will simply be collated into the existing list.

4. Criteria

4.1. The Committee will publish annually the criteria that it will use in assessing requests. The current criteria were developed with input from all Heads and Directors.

4.2. The general objective of the Committee is to ensure that the academic integrity of the University's programs is preserved and that the resources needed to meet that objective are distributed in as equitable a fashion as possible.

4.3. It was decided that although quantitative data will be used in arriving at decisions, it would not be possible to make decisions in a purely formulaic fashion, as there are other factors that must be considered.

4.4. The following list of criteria is presented in no particular order.

   4.4.1.   The committee will value trans-disciplinary and interdisciplinary submissions.

   4.4.2.   Program Viability – if not awarding a position to a unit will make the program offered by that unit non-viable, and the Faculty in question feels that the ability to offer said program is essential to its overall objectives, they may give a position request a high ranking on this basis. Examples of how this might apply could include;
      4.4.2.1.   A small academic unit that does not have particularly high enrolments but a reduction in Faculty complement would make it impossible to continue to offer the major
      4.4.2.2.   Accreditation requirements stipulate a minimum number of faculty and/or courses be offered

   4.4.3.   Curriculum delivery – there are numerous factors that need to be considered with respect to delivery of curriculum. Examples include;
      4.4.3.1.   Need for small class sizes in languages and areas where class discussion is an important pedagogical tool
      4.4.3.2.   Ability to offer courses in an appropriate sequence at the appropriate level
      4.4.3.3.   Level of reliance on CLTs or part-time instruction

   4.4.4.   Full Course Equivalents (FCE) – We will examine these numbers for the most recent ten-year period to detect any trends. In addition to total FCE count, we will also examine the FCE by major and non-major enrollments to assess the relative contributions of core and service courses

   4.4.5.   Lab enrolments

   4.4.6.   Number of majors, number of combined majors, and number of students enrolled in special programs (e.g. language competency certificates)

   4.4.7.   Number of honours theses

   4.4.8.   Number of Full time Equivalents (FTE)

   4.4.9.   Full-time and part-time graduate enrolments

   4.4.10. Existing staffing levels within the unit by category

4.4.11. Overall equity – is there a reasonable balance of enrolments and faculty across all disciplines and faculties?

4.4.12. Special considerations – any recommendations that arise from program review, new initiatives, etc.

4.5. Comparisons will be made on a Faculty level, between Faculties, and to the university total. To facilitate such comparisons, five-year averages will be calculated for a number of these variables, for each department/school and Faculty.

4.6. In order to facilitate the evaluation of trends, parameters that are sensitive to global enrolments will be normalized to totals.

5. Data for TTTCAC Consideration

5.1. This section gives definitions and parameters for the data provided from the Registrar's Office to the TTTCAC on an annual basis.

5.2. Each worksheet in the workbook provided by the Registrar contains all the information required for a particular department. If Interdisciplinary (IDST) courses are attributed to a department, they are included for the particular department.

5.3. All counts are as of December 1 of a given year. Official counts for the year are generated on that day, allowing consistency in longitudinal analysis. Acadia Divinity College courses and programs are not included. Open Acadia courses are also excluded.

5.4. Definitions:

5.4.1. **Full-time undergraduate**: Registered in 9 credit hours or more in the first term on the December 1 count date. This is the count of the students registered in a particular program, as determined by their first degree and major.

5.4.2. **Part-time undergraduate**: Registered in fewer than 9 but more than 0 credit hours in the first term on the December 1 count date. This is the count of the students registered in a particular program, as determined by their first degree and major.

5.4.3. **Full Time Equivalent (FTE) in Program (undergraduate):** Any undergraduate student enrolled as a full-time student is considered one (1.00) FTE. A student taking greater than a normal course load is still considered 1.00 FTE. For part time students, portions of an FTE are determined by dividing the number of credit hours in which the student is enrolled by 30. For example, if a department had one full-time student, plus one student taking one 3 credit hour course, the FTE would be $1.00 + (3/30) = 1.1$.

5.4.4. **Full-time graduate:** Determined by program requirements. Non-Masters of Education graduate students are marked as full-time for their first, and if appropriate, second year. Until 2008, Masters of Education students have been marked as full-time or part time depending on their status at admission. A full-time graduate is one (1.00) FTE.

5.4.5. **Part time graduate:** As per Statistics Canada and Maritime Provinces Higher Education definitions, a part time graduate student is .33 FTE regardless of the number of credit hours enrolled.

5.4.6. **Second degrees:** Counts of students enrolled in a second degree simultaneously with the first degree. An example would be BASC/CAS.

5.4.7. **Second majors:** Counts of students enrolled in a second major simultaneously with the first major. The second major count combines full-time and part time counts and is used for information purposes. It does not factor into the FTE.

5.4.8. **Full Course Equivalents (FCE):** Full course equivalents are determined by multiplying the count of enrolment in a course by the course credit hour weight and dividing by six. For example, a 3 credit hour course with four students enrolled would be:

(4*3)/6= 2 FCE

FCE is based on the number of students enrolled in the course (first term, second term and full year) as of December 1.

5.4.9. **Major FCE:** Full course equivalents of the students who are in the degree or major that match the discipline. For example, BBA students would be considered in the major for Business courses, but BRM students who require Business courses for their program would not be considered in the major. Communications courses were assigned to Business or the School of Recreation Management FCE's by section.

5.4.10. **Non-Major FCE:** Full course equivalents of students who are not in the degree or major that matches the discipline. For example, IDST always has all enrolments in the non-major FCE category.

5.4.11. **FCE as a % of the Total FCE for Acadia:** To normalize the FCE compared to the overall enrolments at Acadia University, the FCE percentages presented are based on the FCE of the course divided by the total undergraduate FCE's for the university for that year.

For departments with multiple disciplines (History and Classics, or Languages, for example), FCE's are given for each of the disciplines, then for the department.

5.4.12. **Labs:** Head counts in laboratories associated with courses within the discipline. Lab head counts are of those enrolments for first term and second term as of December 1.

5.4.13. **Non-credit Head Counts**: Head counts in non-credit courses within the discipline. Non-credit head counts are of those enrolments for first term and second term as of December 1.

5.4.14. **Enrolments in Thesis Courses:** Enrolments per year. Does not reflect a completed thesis in that year, so students may be counted in the thesis counts more than one year.

5.4.15. **Grads(FCE):** <u>Head count</u> is the total number of students registered in graduate courses in the discipline in the Fall/Winter term in the given year (i.e., number of students in each course times the number of courses). <u>FCE</u> is determined as above. <u>Non-credit</u> is as above. Open Acadia courses are not included.

5.4.16. **Average class size:** Total number of students enrolled in the class on December 1 for first term and second term courses. Students who have dropped with a 'W' are not included. Coop, Intern, Labs, Open Acadia and Exchange courses are not included. Average class sizes are given separately for undergraduate and graduate.

Additional Information

5.5. In addition to the raw data provided by the registrar's office, the TTTCAC also calculates additional information to facilitate comparisons across units. For example, average scores for each unit across the past five years are calculated for a number of measures, and appear in the summary page (last tab) of the registrar's spreadsheet. Averages are calculated for the following fields:

5.5.1. FTES in program;

5.5.2. number of second majors;

5.5.3. major, non-major, and

5.5.4. total FCEs (as a percentage of overall enrollment, as described above);

5.5.5. head counts in labs;

5.5.6. number of undergrad theses;

5.5.7. number of grad theses;

5.5.8. grad student FCEs; and

5.5.9. average class size for years 1-4 and overall.

5.5.10. For departments/ schools with multiple disciplines, totals are calculated for most fields, but the average class sizes are for the largest sub-discipline within the department. The committee recognizes that average scores may mask considerable variability across time, and will examine the year-by-year data for trends over time, in addition to these averages.

5.6. To assist in visualizing trends in total FCEs over time, the TTTCAC also creates a graph for each discipline, plotting the Total FCE% (i.e., number of FCEs in that unit as a percentage of the total FCEs at the university) against time, usually across the last decade. A few anomalous points have been excluded from these graphs. For example, in English and Theatre Studies, there was a significant spike in 2001 associated with the "no declared major" experiment in Arts. We have therefore only graphed the trend for the years 2002-2010 for English.

5.7. To assist in comparison of these trend lines, we also took the slope of the line of best fit for each graph. This value appears below the graph in the main spreadsheet and in the column "FCE Trend" in the summary spreadsheet. In general, a positive value for this number indicates that enrolment within the unit has shown an increasing trend over time; a negative value indicates that enrolment has been decreasing over time; and a value close to zero indicates stable enrolment over time.

    5.7.1. More specifically, a "Normalized FCE Trend" value of 10×10^{-4} indicates that, on average, the "Total FCE%" for that unit rose by 0.1% per year. Thus, if the unit started with 2% of the total FCEs in year 1, by the end of the decade (nine years later), they would have increased to approximately 2.9% of the total FCEs. Again, of course, there may be considerable variability across time, and the committee will also examine the actual graphs, not just these summary numbers.

5.8. In addition to the information contained in the circulated spreadsheet, the TTTCAC also calculates some additional values once the Unit Complement Reports have been received. Specifically, to facilitate comparisons across units of different sizes, the TTTCAC calculates three measures of FCEs adjusted by the number of available teaching staff within the unit: (1) FCEs / Tenure Track faculty members; (2) FCEs / full-time professors; and (3) FCEs (including labs) / full-time teaching staff.

These figures are calculated for the last year for which complete data are available, normally the previous academic year. Information on part-time faculty members are collected in the Unit Complement Reports for context, but they are not included in these calculations, as counting part-time instructors is occasionally complex, and the committee is focused on TT replacements.

It is acknowledged that there may be alternative ways of calculating these numbers, and that slight inaccuracies may exist in some instances; however, the intention is to come up with some justifiable set of numbers that can then be applied consistently across all units.

    5.8.1. FCEs / Tenure Track faculty members:

        5.8.1.1.   FCEs are total FCEs (sum of major and non-major FCEs), as reported by the registrar, not including labs.

5.8.1.2.   Tenure track (TT) faculty members are as reported in the Unit Complement Report (1st line). This number includes the Head or Director, if they are tenured or tenure-track. Fractional appointments are included as the appropriate fraction (e.g., a half-time TT faculty member counts as 0.5). CRC chairs are counted as 1/5 or 0.2 of a TT faculty member, as they normally teach 1 course (out of a standard load of 5 courses).

5.8.2. FCEs / full-time professors:

5.8.2.1.   FCEs are as defined in 5.8.1.1

5.8.2.2.   Full time (FT) professors include TT faculty members as defined in 5.8.1.2, plus CLTs and Teaching Instructors.

5.8.2.2.1.   CLTs are as reported in lines 2-4 of the Unit Complement report, and include on-going or protected CLTs, replacement CLTs for individuals on leave, and non-replacement CLTS.

5.8.2.2.2.   Teaching Instructors (line 5 of the Unit Complement report) are individuals who taught the equivalent of a full-time load of part-time courses for 3+ years in a row, and were converted to Instructor status according to Article 11.14 of the 13th Collective Agreement. They are counted as "professors", rather than "instructors", because their teaching patterns more closely resemble those of professors (i.e., their standard load is 15 hours, and they generally teach regular courses, not labs). Again, fractional appointments are reported as the appropriate fraction.

5.8.3. FCEs (including labs) / full-time teaching staff:

5.8.3.1.   FCEs as defined in 5.8.1.1 are added to lab numbers, converted into FCE equivalents. One FCE is equivalent to one student taking one 6-hour lecture course. To translate the lab numbers as reported by the registrar into FCE equivalents, some conversion is necessary. First, the number of students enrolled in the lab, as reported by the registrar, is divided by 2, because lab hours only count as ½ of lecture hours, in terms of course credit and payment. The resulting number is then divided by 2 again, for 3-hour labs, or by 4, for 1.5-hour labs. This is done because the number provided by the registrar for labs is a simple head count, rather than being reported in 6-hour FCE units. Thus, one student taking two three-hour labs counts as 2 units in the registrar's number, but is really equivalent to only one 6-hour FCE.

5.8.3.2.   The resulting number for FCEs including labs is then divided by the total number of full-time teaching staff. This number includes full-time professors, as defined in 5.8.2.2, plus Instructors (lines 6 and 7 of the Unit Complement Report). Instructors are counted as equivalent to 9/15 (or 0.6) of a tenure-track faculty member, using the following reasoning: the normal teaching load for instructors is 18 hours of lab time, which is deemed equivalent to 9 hours of class/lecture time. The normal teaching load for TT faculty members is 15 class/lecture hours, therefore instructors teach the equivalent of 9/15 of a TT faculty member.

Curriculum Changes for the March 2012 Senate Meeting

Faculty of Arts

School of Music

New courses:

MUSI 1693 – Playing and Hearing Music – An introduction to fundamental principles of practical musicianship. Students will discover how to conceive of and relate to sound both as soloists and ensemble members through progressive exercises and assignments to develop critical listening skills, internal conception of sound, improvisation, transcription and aural analysis, performance and practice habits, and ensemble awareness.

Musi 3523 Piano Class for Music Therapy: This course is designed to meet the Recommended Areas of Competence for Keyboard Skills as outlined by the Canadian Association for Music Therapy (CAMT). This is a required course for the Bachelor of Music Therapy degree. Keyboard skills and concepts are taught and evaluated as they apply to music therapy clinical practice. Pre-requisite: RCM Grade IV Piano.

Program modification:

Many of our Bachelor of Music programs require a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.33 after 2nd year to continue with the program. **We would like to change this to 3.0**. This would affect the BM degrees in Instrumental Performance, Vocal Performance, Music Education, Composition, Musicology, and Comprehensive.

Bachelor of Music in Instrumental Performance, Vocal Performance, Music Education, Composition, Musicology, and Comprehensive:
Students must achieve a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.33 and complete the piano proficiency requirement by the end of 2nd year to continue in this program.
Becomes:
Students must achieve a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0 and complete the piano proficiency requirement by the end of 2nd year to continue in this program.

Music Therapy
Summary:
1. Principal Applied in first two years of study
2. Addition of 3rd-year keyboard class for music therapy students
3. Eliminate History requirements to allow for more psychology and science electives
4. Minimum GPA, piano proficiency, and essay requirement by end of 2nd year

Bachelor of Music Therapy (126h)
This program provides students with the opportunity to gain an understanding of music therapy theory and research, as well as proficiency in clinical practice. The program requires a high level of musicianship on more than one instrument. The supervised clinical placements provide experience working with diverse clinical populations. Following graduation a 1000-hour (six month) internship is required to be eligible for accreditation with The Canadian Association for Music Therapy.

Students must achieve a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.00, complete the piano proficiency requirement, and a brief essay on the arc of his/her academic and practical learning in music therapy by the end of 2nd year to continue in the program.

1. Musi 1133, 1130L, 1143, 1140L, 1253, 1263, 2133, 2130L, 2143, 2140L, 2163 (21h)
2. Music 1563, 2573, 3563, 3560L, 3573, 3570L, 4563, 4560L, 4573, 4570L (18h)
3. **Music 1666, 2666 (Principal Applied), Music 4663 (Secondary Applied Guitar) (15h)**
4. **Music 1333, 1353, 2083, 3523, 4553 (15h)**
5. **6h English (6h)**
6. Psyc 1013, 1023, 2113, 2153 plus 6h additional Psychology; Biol 1813 (21h)
7. **12h music electives (12h)**
8. **12h non-music electives (12h)**
9. First year music therapy students will take Musi 1600 and one section of either Musi 2701 or 2800. Students in each subsequent year will take one section of Musi 2701. Students must successfully complete both the fall and winter terms of each ensemble. (6h)

Faculty of Pure and Applied Science

Modification to the
Bachelor of Science (Major),
Bachelor of Science (Double Major),
Bachelor of Science with Honours,
Bachelor of Science with Honours and Second Major, and
Bachelor of Science (Foundation Option) (42/18/18/18 Major)

6h English or one language other than English
Becomes:
6h selected from English, Art at the 1000-level, Classics, Comparative Religion, a single language other than English, History, Music (not applied, vocal or instrumental methods, or practical studies) Philosophy, Theology (THEO 3013/23, BIBL 2013/23, GREE 3013/23), or Women's and Gender Studies.

Chemistry Department

Most disciplines in FPAS have defined the set of required courses for their double majors. The Chemistry Department decided to conform, providing students with more clear description of the degree expectations.
Chemistry as second major: 30h chemistry chosen in consultation with the chemistry department (30H); math 1013/1023
Becomes:
Chemistry as the second major: Math 1013, 1023 (6h) and the choice of:
Organic/Inorganic Option: Chem 1113/1123 or 1013/1023, 2303, 2513, 2533, 3303 or 3313, 3513 or 3523 and 9h additional chemistry courses chosen in consultation with the Department (30h).
Physical/Analytical Option: Chem 1113/1123 or 1013/1023, 2103, 2513, 2813, 3103, 3823 and 9h additional chemistry courses chosen in consultation with the department (30h)
Biochemistry/Organic Chemistry Option: Chem 1113/1123 or 1013/1023, 2513, 2533, 2713, 3513, 3723 and 9h additional chemistry courses chosen in consultation with the Department (30h).

School of Computer Science

The language course requirements for the BCS, BCSH and BCSS degrees are to be changed as per the changes to the BSc degrees plus the option of COMM 1213 and 1223

6h English or one language other than English

to:

6h selected from English, Art at the 1000-level, Classics, Comparative Religion, a single language other than English, History, Music (not applied, vocal or instrumental methods, or practical studies) Philosophy, Theology (THEO 3013/23, BIBL 2013/23, GREE 3013/23), Women's and Gender Studies, or COMM 1213 and 1223.

School of Nutrition and Dietetics

Modification to the:

Bachelor of Science in Nutrition

Bachelor of Science in Nutrition (Dietetics option)

Bachelor of Science in Nutrition (Health and Development option)

Bachelor of Science in Nutrition (Kinesiology option)

Bachelor of Science in Nutrition with second major in biology

English or one language other than English (6h)

Becomes:

6h selected from English, Art at the 1000-level, Classics, Comparative Religion, a single language other than English, History, Music (not applied, vocal or instrumental methods, or practical studies), Philosophy, Theology (Theo 3013/23, Bibl 2013/23, Gree 3013/23), or Women's and Gender Studies (6h).

Bachelor of Science in Nutrition

Change to the Nutrition core: Nutr ~~1513~~, ~~2203~~, ~~2213~~, ~~2503~~, ~~2513~~, **1313, 1323, 1333, 1343, 2323,** 3713, 3723, 4533, 4903 (27h)

Bachelor of Science in Nutrition (Kinesiology option)

Adding Nutr 4223 (Sensory Evaluation of Food) as a required course (to replace one of the 3h nutrition electives) and 6 hours of Arts electives (thereby reducing the number of University electives) is for consistency with our other programs.

1. The nutrition core (27h)
2. Kine 3013 and 12h Kine electives (other than Kine 2293, 2413, 2423) (15h)
3. Biol 1813, 3h Biol elective, Biol 2813/2823 or Kine 2413/2423 (credit can only be obtained for one of these pairs of courses) (12h)
4. Chem 1013, 1023, 2513, 2713 (12h)
5. Math 1213/1223 or 2233/2243 (6h)
6. Psyc 1013, 1023 (6h)
7. Nutr 3543, **4223,** 4523, ~~9h~~ **6h** Nutr electives (15h)
8. ~~English or one language other than English (6h)~~ 6h selected from English, Art at the 1000- level, Classics, Comparative Religion, a single language other than English, History, Music (not applied, vocal or instrumental methods, or practical studies), Philosophy, Theology (THEO 3013/23, BIBL 2013/23, GREE 3013/23), or Women's and Gender Studies (6h)

9. **6h from the Faculty of Arts (6h)**

10. ~~21h~~ **15h** university electives **(15h)**

- A maximum of 12 students will be accepted each year.
- **Students interested in this option will be considered for admission in the winter semester of their second year in the Bachelor of Science in Nutrition program**.
- An overall cumulative GPA of 2.75 is required for ~~Admissions~~ **admission** to this option.

GRADUATE SUPERVISION
Responsibilities of faculty, students, and administrators

> **NOTE:** The responsibilities and dispute resolution processes outlined in this document apply to students in the 13 masters programs at Acadia within the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science, as well as to students in the PhD program in Educational Studies.

Introduction

This document is intended to provide clear and succinct guidelines for graduate students, faculty supervisors, and administrators on issues related to the supervision of graduate theses and research projects. This is an area of critical importance to the University. Undertaking research is an essential component of graduate study. A good supervisory relationship creates a healthy and supportive environment in which students can accomplish their research and scholarly goals. It also creates a positive and productive environment for faculty supervisors. For many faculty members, the research done by their graduate students not only contributes to their personal research programs, it is frequently an indispensable component of it.

This document has been prepared by the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, with the support and assistance of the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies. It was undertaken with a view to establishing University-wide policy to guide the supervision of graduate-level research. The policies and guidelines contained in this document are intended to bring clarity to the expectations and responsibilities of graduate students and supervisors, and to outline procedures for dealing with conflict and otherwise problematic circumstances in the supervision of graduate research.

Responsibilities

Joint Responsibilities of supervisors and students:

- **Respect.** Every student and faculty supervisor has a right to be treated respectfully. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:
    - Maintaining appointments, except in cases of extenuating circumstances. If cancellation is necessary, provide as much advanced notice as possible.
    - Coming to meetings having read or prepared whatever was agreed upon prior to the appointment.
    - Allowing for disagreements, but recognizing that it is the supervisor's responsibility to guide the direction of, and approach to, the study; no research project will proceed to a public defense without the agreement and written consent of the supervisor, the student, and the head/director of the department/school. If disagreements or disputes arise in the relationship, faculty and students are expected to treat each other in ways that are not hurtful or otherwise disrespectful.
    - Maintaining confidentiality. While not all aspects of a supervisory relationship are confidential, areas that have been identified by one or the other as being such must be respected.
    - Constructing a joint relationship that is free of stereotyping, discrimination, and prejudicial behaviour.

Responsibilities of Supervisors

- **Topic Development**. Supervisors are expected to provide guidance for students in the development of thesis/project topics. This includes offering ideas and generally assisting students in identifying areas within a disciplinary realm that are suitable for investigation. In instances where a student enters the relationship with a well-developed idea for a research study, the faculty supervisor can assist in refining the research focus and delimiting the study.

- **Proposal Development.** Every thesis-based research project at Acadia begins with the development of a formal research proposal by the student. While the length and substance will vary among departments and schools, a proposal serves as a formal agreement, in that it defines what a student is expected to do in order to produce a thesis of high quality. Once the proposal is at the stage where the supervisor feels the study is ready to be launched, he or she will sign a proposal acceptance form and file it, along with a copy of the proposal, in the departmental or school office. A copy will be provided for the student.

  Signing a formal research proposal does not preclude the possibility that research studies can change due to unforeseen circumstances, creating a situation where the purpose of the study as originally stated is not achievable. Where this happens, changes must be jointly agreed upon by the supervisor and the student, and must adhere to departmental or school policy. Substantial changes in focus may require the preparation and submission of a new proposal.

- **Reasonable Access**. Faculty members who have agreed to supervise graduate students are expected to be reasonably accessible for thesis consultation, occasionally on short notice. This may be especially necessary as the research nears completion and defense or graduation/convocation dates near. To whatever extent possible, supervisors should plan with students around likely completion dates in order to avoid interruptions and delays caused by vacations or conference attendance. In cases of leaves of absence or sabbaticals, the supervisor, in consultation with the graduate coordinator, will arrange for a replacement supervisor.

- **Length of Study (timelines)**. It is the responsibility of the faculty supervisor to assist a graduate student in designing a study that is achievable in a reasonable period of time.

- **Constructive and Timely Feedback**. A central component of the research process for graduate students is constructive and timely feedback from supervisors. This is crucial in allowing a student to maintain consistent progress. What constitutes timely feedback is to be negotiated in each supervisory relationship, and perhaps by standards established within departments and schools. Under normal circumstances, students should not expect feedback to be "immediate," but neither should they expect it to be in excess of two (2) weeks.

Constructive and timely feedback is equally crucial in instances where students are not meeting academic expectations. While these conversations can be difficult, it serves no one's interest to prolong a study if success is unlikely.

• **Professional Growth**. Supervisors are expected to support students' professional development by encouraging participation in discipline-specific professional gatherings (e.g., conferences, symposia). Where appropriate, supervisors should encourage the publication (jointly or otherwise) of a student's work.

• **Thesis quality.** It is the responsibility of the supervisor to ensure that the final thesis meets or exceeds the standards of graduate level work at Acadia.

Responsibilities of Students

• **Commitment to Research**. Graduate research takes time and commitment on behalf of students. In discussion with faculty supervisors, students need to plan for sufficient time to complete a thesis or project of substantial scholarly merit. This includes: (i) time needed to gain sufficient background and skills in the research area before initiating the study, (ii) time required to undertake the fieldwork/analysis in a comprehensive and rigorous manner, and (iii) time to produce a thesis manuscript that is thorough, well organized, and lucidly written.

• **Research Proposal.** Each thesis student is required to write and submit a research proposal in consultation with their supervisor that meets the standards established by their department or school.

• **Communication**. Students are expected to maintain regular contact with supervisors to inform them of progress and make them aware of factors that may cause problems or interruptions. It may be helpful if students and supervisors agree upon a schedule of meetings and event horizons, although this may not always be possible. It is important for students to recognize that faculty members have other responsibilities which can delay access on short notice.

• **Ethical Behaviour.** All students are expected to adhere to high ethical standards in undertaking research that involves humans or other animals. This includes close familiarity with the protocols established by the Research Ethics Board or the Animal Care Committee.

Dispute Resolution

At times conflict arises in a supervisory relationship. As uncomfortable as this may be, it is imperative that troubling issues be addressed at an early stage before they lead to a deterioration of the working relationship. Resolution at an early stage should be between the student and the supervisor, without the necessity of involving others. However, given the power imbalance in a supervisor relationship, if students are uncomfortable approaching their supervisors on issues of conflict, or if the supervisory relationship has deteriorated to the point where the likelihood of resolution at this informal stage is remote, the following procedures are to be employed:

• **Graduate Coordinator.** All departments and schools offering graduate programs select a faculty member to serve as their graduate program coordinator. This individual is normally responsible for providing academic counselling for graduate students. However, in cases of conflict in the supervisory relationship, the coordinator serves as the first external point of contact for the student and/or supervisor in seeking resolution. In instances where the graduate coordinator is the supervisor, recourse will be directly to the head or director.

• **Head or Director**. In instances where the graduate coordinator is unable to construct an acceptable solution to the conflict, the head of the department or director of the school will be engaged through the graduate coordinator. In some cases, it may be in the best interest of the student to have a new supervisor appointed. This is done by the head/director and coordinator, in consultation with the student. Appointing a new supervisor will be done without penalty or disadvantage to the graduate student.

  In instances where the head or director is the supervisor, recourse will be directly to the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies.

  A dispute involving a student in Social and Political Thought will skip this step and proceed directly to the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies.

• **Dean of Research and Graduate Studies**. If the dispute is unable to be resolved within the unit, the graduate coordinator or head/director will bring the matter to the attention of the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies. Where appropriate, the Dean will meet with the student or faculty member to seek a resolution. As Acadia does not have a faculty of graduate studies, in instances that directly involve faculty, the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies may request the involvement of the relevant program dean. When necessary, the Dean of RGS will bring the matter to the attention of the Vice President Academic.

Situations that cannot be resolved through these procedures can proceed to the stage of formal appeal as outlined in the University Calendar.

Notice of Motion

The Senate Honours Committee recommends to Senate **that the Registrar of Acadia University become an *ex officio* member of the Senate Honours Committee.**

Submitted by,

Pritam Ranjan
Chair
Senate Honours Committee

Senate Research Committee

Community and Industry Research Collaboration Day

Update for Senate:

Following last year's Research Summit, the Senate Research Committee is planning a day-long event that celebrates Acadia's many community- and industry-based research collaborations. The tentative date is **Friday, May 4th**. [This is the same day as the Huggins Science Seminar, and both events are planned for the KCIC. While the two are unrelated, having them at the same time affords an opportunity for high school students to tour the displays and talk with researchers and community collaborators.]

This celebratory event will provide an opportunity to bring together community/industry partners and researchers to highlight current research activities and to consider new ones. The Committee also envisions drawing an audience of *potential* collaborators from both industry and community sectors.

Two planned components to the day:

- **An open showcase of interactive displays (suggested location, KCIC Garden Room);**

  Our intention is that the open displays will include representation from all departments and schools, but also target specific projects/researchers. Participants will be asked to create a display that is as interactive as possible and encouraged to utilize a variety of media. These displays will be open to the public and the campus community throughout the day and researchers will be requested to include their student researchers/assistants wherever possible.

- **Four panel discussions highlighting specific research areas (suggested location, KCIC Acadia Room).**

  The Panel discussions will focus on four (4) specific research areas and will ideally include three researchers, three community/industry representatives, and an individual who will speak on funding opportunities. Each panel discussion will be 50 minutes in length and allow the researchers to provide a brief (5 minute) overview of their current research while community and industry participants will be asked to address research needs or potential project areas they would like to see developed (5 minutes each). A moderator will facilitate each session and 20 minutes will be left open for questions and discussion, including a short overview of potential funding opportunities provided by the moderator, a representative of RGS, or the Senate Research Committee.

  Four focus areas:

  Tidal energy
  Agri-food
  Health and Wellness
  Diversity

ACADIA UNIVERSITY

A Process for Reviewing the Strategic Research Plan

Background

Acadia's original Institutional Research Plan (subsequently renamed the Strategic Research Plan) was developed in 2000 in response to the requirement of the new CRC Program and the ongoing CFI Program. As such, it was intended to guide Acadia's participation in these programs. The development of the SRP was led by the Vice President Academic, Dr. Michael Leiter, in collaboration with the Deans and the Co-Directors (Dr. Cynthia Alexander and Dr. Robert Perrins) of Research & Graduate Studies, who consulted with individual researchers, research centres, and academic units in preparing the document. The recommendations of the Academic Sector Planning Committee in its document, *Planning Issues for 2000*, were a primary reference for the development of the SRP (including the initial identification of four of the key research areas). The SRP was formally submitted to the President in August, 2000.

A number of minor revisions were made to the document beginning in 2001. In 2004, the University began a major Strategic Planning exercise focused on its academic programs. At that time, it was identified that the SRP needed to be updated, so a formal assessment and update of the Acadia SRP was initiated by the Vice President Academic, Dr. Ralph Nilson, as a subproject of this larger initiative. The updated SRP was intended to guide Acadia's specific research agenda and priorities, and was to include reviews of research centres, governance, research chairs, grants, contracts, and other institutional and community based research activity. An Advisory Committee representative of Acadia's research community (faculty, CRCs, students) was struck to spearhead the review, and there was a Terms of Reference issued for that Committee. The Committee was chaired by the Acting Dean of Research & Graduate Studies, Dr. Wendy Bedingfield. As part of the assessment, Gwen Phillips (Office of the Vice President Academic) also reviewed whether Acadia's objectives were being met within the original SRP, and issued an Interim Report on the Implementation of Acadia's Institutional Research Plan (April, 2005).

The Senate Committee on Research & Graduate Studies (SCRGS) approved the updated SRP before it went to Senate in January, 2006. Senate approved the updated SRP with the rider that the SCRGS be tasked to design an ongoing, consultative process to review and update the SRP on a regular basis. The intent appeared to be that the process would go to Senate for approval within 12 months (January, 2007), and the 2006-2007 responsibilities for the SCRGS indicate one of their duties was to establish, propose to Senate for approval, and subsequently implement, a consultative process for regular reviews of the Acadia SRP. It appears this was discussed by the SCRGS in 2006, but perhaps never completed.

This current Senate Research Committee, by this document, proposes to Senate a process for ongoing reviews of the Strategic Research Plan.

PROPOSED REVIEW PROCESS

Lead:

    Dean of Research & Graduate Studies

Advisory Committee: Senate Research Committee, including:
- Coordinator of Research and Innovation, R&GS *(ex officio)*
- Research Office Administrator, R&GS *(ex officio)*

Process:

A. Establish guiding principles to inform the development of the Strategic Research Plan
   In order to establish a SRP, guiding principles are necessary to provide a structure and focus to the process. These will be developed in draft form by the Senate Research Committee, the deans, and the Vice President Academic. The guidelines will be submitted to Senate for discussion and approval.

B. Establishment of a SRP baseline database
   The value in developing a database is that it will assist in answering the following question: what do we know about the success/impact of the current Strategic Research Plan? The database can include (1) a repository of publications and presentations that pertain to the six current research themes, (2) record in attracting, retaining, and contributions of, Canada Research Chairs, (3) impact on curriculum and pedagogical practices, (4) impact, if any, on our success in attracting graduate students, (5) influence on theses undertaken by Honours students; and (6) Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) investments and their relationship to the SRP.

C. Initial within-faculty fora
   A link to the database in (A) above will be made available to all members of the university community. Following this, each faculty – through faculty councils – will be asked to develop a list of questions and issues that can inform the focus group interviews specifically, and the overall process generally.

D. Call for input
   As not all members of the campus community will have an opportunity to participate in the focus group interviews or open fora, or feel comfortable in doing so, an invitation will be sent to the University community inviting individuals to submit comments on the existing SRP and the process for developing a new one. These submissions will be held in confidence by Research & Graduate Studies.

E. Focus group interviews
   The rationale for conducting focus group interviews in each faculty is that it provides an opportunity to identify potential strategic directions that are relevant to individual faculties. Each faculty will select individuals to participate in the interviews.

        Faculty of Arts
        Faculty of Professional Studies
        Faculty of Pure and Applied Science
        Faculty of Theology
        Senior Administration (President and all VPs)
        Directors of research centres
        Undergraduate and graduate students
        CRCs

F.   Preparation of a draft document based on the focus group interviews, faculty fora, and individual submissions

G.   Open forum on draft document :

        Faculty of Arts
        Faculty of Professional Studies
        Faculty of Pure and Applied Science
        Faculty of Theology

H.   Revision of draft document, based on open forum feedback

I.   Report and Committee recommendations to Senate

A brief report on the Honours Forum
(April 5 and 6, 2011)

Senate Honours Committee

The forum discussed the benefits of the honours program for students and faculty members. An overview of responses:

> **Students' viewpoint**. The honours program means (1) a higher degree of disciplinary focus than an undergraduate degree with a specific major; (2) the development of an in-depth research project, problem solving skills, and critical thinking; and (3) it encourages freedom of thinking, i.e., students are writing deeply, and not just thinking about "getting it done."

> **Faculty members' perspective**. Many faculty members feel that (1) it is rewarding to work with students at a higher level than through regular course work; (2) that tracking the success of students - especially those continuing on to graduate school – is a way of demonstrating the success of programs in the academic/professional community; and (3) students are engaged in research, which sometimes results in joint publications.

Forum participants were also asked to comment on the ideal thesis process, what an Acadia honours degree means to the rest of the academic world, and whether there is a way to "brand" it as an Acadia product.

Regarding the "the ideal thesis process", several issues were raised in the forum.

1. **The entry level of the students for the honours program** –forum participants discussed GPA requirements, time of entry in the honours program (e.g., at the beginning/end of 2nd or 3rd year), and writing skills. The Senate Honours Committee (SHC) is currently discussing this issue.
2. **Thesis proposal** –forum members suggested that a proposal is essential. The current SHC is discussing a format of the proposal that can be used by all faculties at the university and the timeline for submitting the proposal to R&GS.
3. **Thesis submission date** – forum participants agreed that under normal circumstances the submission date should be kept before the beginning of the exam period, which will allow sufficient time for a proper review process.
4. **Examination and Grading** – the forum members showed strong support for the close involvement of the second reader in the honours thesis. It was pointed out the second reader should be empowered to assign a (number) grade to the thesis, and perhaps, the second reader's name should also appear on the completed thesis along with the department head and supervisor(s). It turns out that the grading scheme varies from unit to unit. A few departments and schools have formal grading schemes that may or may not involve the second reader, whereas other units do not. The SHC is discussing this issue and will explore the feasibility of making the grading scheme more formal (i.e., grade distribution over the proposal, research, writing, and oral presentation (if any) by the supervisor and the reviewers).

5. **Role of the external reader** – the forum participants showed strong support for the external readers. There was some discussion on who would be an ideal external reader and the time constraints in getting thorough the external review process. The SHC agrees that the current external review process for the honours thesis is not very efficient in terms of utilizing the reviewer's time and expertise. Forum participants suggested selecting externals from a cognate department. The SHC noted that the survey conducted by a previous SHC also showed some dissatisfaction with the external review process. The SHC is discussing possible modifications to the external review process.

We are discussing the issues listed above, and will report the outcomes of our discussion as soon as we have something substantial. The information presented on the honours forum held in April 2011 is based on the notes and summary prepared by the previous Honours Committee chair (Dr. Sonia Hewitt).

Senate Honours Committee (Chair)

Pritam Ranjan

(Date: March 02, 2012)

Senate By-Laws Report
March 6, 2012

A meeting of the Senate By-Laws Committee was held on February 3, 2012 to address items of business referred by Senate Chair, Dr. Diane Holmberg.

Committee Membership
Heather A. Kitchin (Chair)
Barb Anderson
William Brackney

Currently, the Committee is missing a representative from Professional Studies. The Senate Nominating Committee Chair is aware of this and working to address the gap.

1. After reviewing the mandates of various Senate committees, the By-Laws Committee unanimously agreed that the Mandate and procedural principles of the current By-Laws Committee will be as follows:

    A. Meetings of the Committee will be held as issues emerge.

    B. As a group, we are committed to ensuring that we carry out the mandate of the Committee recognizing our boundaries. In accordance with past practice, the Committee will remain advisory and responsive in nature as issues emerge in Senate.

    C. The By-Laws Committee will respect the formal mandates of all Senate Committees (including that of the By-Laws Committee), as delineated in *The Constitution and By-Laws of the Senate of Acadia University*.

2. **Queries from Senate Chair Dr. Diane Holmberg**
    A. Non-staggered committee memberships
        After discussing the issue raised by the Senate Chair, the Senate By-laws Committee members is confident that the issue of monitoring the staggering of Senate Committees rests with the Recording Secretary of Senate. Sections III (b) and (c –point 4) of the Constitution are clear on this role.

        i.   There shall also be a Recording Secretary whose duties and responsibilities shall be:
             * to prepare and distribute agendas for Senate meetings;
             * to record, prepare and distribute the Minutes of Senate meetings;
             * to keep an up-to-date list of the membership of all standing and *ad hoc* committees of Senate. This list shall be distributed with the agenda of the September meeting.
             * to prepare and maintain a Senate Web Site of approved minutes, most recent agenda, and list of current Senators.

        ii. The Recording Secretary shall, on an on-going basis, with the Chair of Senate review all vacancies on standing and *ad hoc* committees of Senate. When a vacancy occurs, the Chair of Senate will instruct the Faculty Chair or the Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee, as appropriate, to initiate the nominating/election procedures to fill the vacancy.

B. <u>Senator composition Senate Committee Students with Disabilities that affect Learning (SCSDAL)</u>

The current mandate of this Senate Committee holds that all faculty members sitting on this Committee be acting Senators.

This requirement severely limits the pool of nominations. As a result, the issue has been raised in Senate as to whether the all senator faculty requirement for SCSDAL be changed to allow membership beyond that of Senators only.

Chair, Dr. Heather A. Kitchin has contacted Dr. Michael Corbett, as Chair of the Senate *Nominations Committee*, and Dr. Janice Best, as Chair of the Senate Committee *Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning,* to discuss the most appropriate procedure for moving forward inasmuch as the issue of committee constitution is directed by these particular two committees.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Heather A. Kitchin, Chair, Senate By-Laws Committee

Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning

(2011 – 2012)
March 12, 2012

Members
Janice Best (FA, chair)
Emma Cochrane (student representative)
Mike Corbett (FPS)
Jill Davies (Academic Support Coordinator)
Diane Holmberg (FPAS, until January)
Carol Anne Janzen (DC)
Rosemary Jotcham (Registrar)
Kathy O'Rourke (Disability Resource Facilitator)
Marlene Snyder (FPAS, starting in January)

The Senate Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning has met four times (2 November, 29 November, 6 February, 12 March). At the November meeting, Janice Best was elected chair. In January, Marlene Snyder was elected as the FPAS representative to replace Diane Holmberg who resigned from the committee in order to take up her position as Chair of Senate

There has been a staff change in Disability Access. Last spring Suzanne Robicheau resigned and has been replaced by Kathy O'Rourke as the Disability Resource Facilitator. Kathy maintains her role as Exam Coordinator. Disability Access has seen a steady increase in students requiring accommodations; there has been an approximate 30 % increase midterm / exam accommodations over last year. The increase in numbers is being handled well and everything continues to run efficiently.

There are several student projects focusing on the benefits of accommodation for students with disabilities in a small university setting. In particular, a 4th year Sociology student, Victoria Hornell Kennedy, has recently completed a thesis on issues related to learning differences at Acadia University and whether students who struggle with these difficulties have a heightened benefit if they pursue an education at a smaller post-secondary institution. Victoria's work examined whether a university that fosters smaller class sizes, more nuanced academic relationships between faculty/staff and students, and an organic sense of community would better assist and equip students who otherwise struggle with academia. Victoria's work, which will be presented in April at the Emergent Learning Conference, Turning Tides in 21st Century Education, applauds Acadia for the work we do with students who self-identify as having learning differences. She cites the support of the Acadia community -- students, faculty and staff of Disability Access -- as enhancing students' academic success and self-confidence.

On behalf of the committee Diane Holmberg met on several occasions with Darryl Youden, Roxanne Seaman, John Colton and Marcel Falkenham, a group looking at questions of accessibility on campus. A number of students in Roxanne Seaman's classes will be engaged in projects examining the accessibility of various buildings on campus. There may be grants available from various levels of government that could be used to improve infrastructure and improve accessibility on campus. Several improvements have recently been made on campus, notably to Patterson Hall, the new Biology building, and to Cutten. Public washrooms on all 3 floors of Cutten are accessible and there are suites on each of the 3 floors that are fully accessible. The SRC is also exploring the possibility of renovating the SUB in order to increase accessibility.

The committee also discussed the issue of fire safety and plans for the evacuation of students and staff with temporary or permanent mobility problems. A recent fire drill in the BAC seemed to indicate that there was no plan in place for ensuring the safety of these individuals. The matter has been referred to the Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee and to the Health and Safety Officer.

In November, the committee adopted new policies and procedures regarding the use of fact sheets as an exam accommodation. Fact sheets are a rarely-used exam accommodation intended for students whose documented disabilities clearly have an impact on their ability to retrieve information that has been learned. Fact sheets include strategy cues intended to assist students in retrieving the material they have learned. Fact sheets can also contain reference information related to specific subjects as recommended in student assessments. These sheets are created by students in consultation with professors. The use of a fact sheet for a given test or exam requires the professor's express approval of its specific contents and cannot compromise the academic integrity of the exam. The SCSDAL Procedures regarding Support and Accommodation for Students with Disabilities have been amended to reflect this change, and are attached for information. Guidelines concerning the use of fact sheets have also been posted on the Disability Access website. The committee conducted an annual review of the SCSDAL's policies and is not did not see any need for changes.

At the request of the Senate By-Laws committee, the SCSDAL committee is currently reviewing the requirement that the elected faculty members of this committee be Senators, nominated by the Nominating Committee and elected by Senate.

Procedures Regarding Support and Accommodation for Students with Disabilities (March 2012)

1. Accommodations for students with disabilities shall be coordinated through the offices of the Academic Support Coordinator and the Disability Resource Facilitator.

2. Students with disabilities desiring accommodations must identify themselves to the office of the Academic Support Coordinator.

3. Students with disabilities desiring accommodations shall provide the office of the Academic Support Coordinator with *the most recent assessments of the student's disability, conducted within the last five years.* These assessments must be done by a qualified external assessor with appropriate knowledge of the disability in question (e.g., a physician for a physical disability; an audiologist for a hearing impairment; a physician, psychologist, or psychiatrist for a psychiatric disability, etc.). The student is responsible for any costs associated with obtaining this assessment.

4. The assessments shall include recommendations that will provide a framework for accommodations for each student. The appropriate and available accommodations will then be negotiated between the student and Disability Access Services. Accommodations that may be provided by the University include, but are not limited to: alternative locations for examinations, extended periods of time for examinations, tutors, note takers, scribes, and assistive technology**, and fact sheets.**

5. At the beginning of each term, students with disabilities who desire accommodations shall have each of their instructors sign an Instructor Verification Form, indicating that the student is registered with Disability Access Services. Professors will then be sent an electronic copy of an Information Sheet that indicates the specific accommodations to which the student is entitled according to his or her professional assessment. Note that students may or may not choose to access all of the accommodations to which they are entitled in a particular course.

6. In many cases, accommodations are arranged between the student and Disability Access Services, and require little direct action on the part of the professor. If the student requires any direct action from the professor to provide accommodations, then it is the student's responsibility to inform the professor and to provide the professor sufficient advance notice. The professor and the student can then discuss the best way to provide appropriate accommodations while still meeting the professor's learning goals for the course.

7. Students will arrange with Disability Access Services if they wish to write tests or exams in an alternate location. Professors will be contacted by Disability Access Services with the names of students in their courses who have asked for testing accommodations. Professors will ensure that a copy of their test is delivered to Disability Access Services. Staff at Disability Access Services will arrange invigilation of tests. Professors will be consulted regarding the location of alternative examinations.

8. Students requiring note-taking services, as recommended in their assessment, should contact the Disability Resource Facilitator. Disability Access Services will contact professors with the names of students in their courses who have requested note-taking services. Professors will be asked to circulate a request to all students in their class, asking those interested in providing notes to contact the Disability Resource Facilitator. The Disability Resource Facilitator will receive offers from prospective note-takers, review samples of notes, and confirm the name of the selected note-taker with both the student who has made the request and that student's professor. In cases for which interrupted attendance is not a function of the student's particular disability, regular class attendance is still expected. If the student is not attending class regularly, then course notes will normally be provided through Disability Access services only for those classes the student does attend; it will be the student's responsibility to secure notes for any classes he or she misses. Students requesting note-taking services will be advised of this provision, and will acknowledge their agreement in writing at the time of making the initial request.

9. Students who require fact-sheets must provide medical documentation indicating the need for this accommodation and what type of information should be included on the fact sheet. Students should request this accommodation at the beginning of a course whenever possible and will normally write their exams in Disability Access. Students must create the fact sheet in consultation with the instructor. The instructor shall provide a copy of the fact sheet to Disability Access either in electronic form from his or her Acadia email account or as a signed hard copy. The fact sheet becomes part of the exam. Fact sheets cannot compromise the academic integrity of the exam.

10. The latest version of the University's Policy on Support and Accommodation for Students with Disabilities, along with the associated Principles and Procedures, will always be posted on the Disability Access Services website. These materials shall be reviewed regularly by the Senate Committee for Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning, normally on an annual basis.

11. Individuals desiring more information about issues regarding students with disabilities, or with questions regarding the policy, principles, or procedures, are encouraged to contact the Disability Access Services office (902-585-1823 or disability.access@acadiau.ca), and/or the Senate Committee for Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning (see http://senate.acadiau.ca/Senate_Comm_Membership.html for information on the current Chair and committee membership).

Report from the Faculty Development Committee (2010-2011)

1.   Introduction.

The Faculty Development Committee was inactive for some time during 2009/10. Three faculty members were appointed to look broadly at the issue of faculty development and bring concise observations and recommendations to Senate. The Faculty Development Committee met on several occasions and respectively submit this report to Senate.

2.   Faculty Development Committee Mandate.

The Faculty Development Committee was unclear of the precise mandate that the committee had and the specific areas of responsibility under its purview. Consequently the committee took a wide understanding of its role to include any and all areas that could be considered relevant to the development of members of Acadia University's four faculties (Arts, Science, Professional Studies & Theology). The committee excluded from its orbit of thought any person not appointed onto the faculty of Acadia University in a permanent contract, tenure track or tenured position. In doing so the committee also recognized that recommendations could also be applied to other teaching 'faculty' at the discretion of either Senate or the relevant Deans.

In particular our Justification for reviewing the FDC's mandate was prompted by the fact that the Senate Research Committee (SRC) duplicates the 'research' element of our mandate. The SRC is more widely representative of the university community and so is better equipped to handle issues directly relating to faculty research. Thus, the first recommendation of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) is that we request that the FDC's mandate be revised to exclude 'research'. This will allow us to focus more clearly on teaching development. The rationale being that quality of teaching and development of faculty teaching credentials as professional educators is core to the success of Acadia University and an expectation of students. The second recommendation is therefore that the mandate of this committee be altered to include to promotion of development of good pedagogical skills and qualifications within the university faculty as a priority area.

3.   Development challenges.

The FDC discussed at length the nature of challenges and barriers to uptake to positive development of teaching skills within the university faculty. One immediate observation was that, with the exception of the Department of Education, it was not clear at all that many members of faculty had benefitted from being trained professionally as educators or teachers in their fields. This was noted as an observation that the committee would like the senate to be aware of together with the recognition that the role of professor and subject matter expert should be complimented by professional training in teaching.

The committee was also concerned to know some key facts that related to resources deemed by the committee as important to improving the opportunity to develop faculty.

These are:

(a) What has been the effect of reducing the Learning Commons teaching on faculty development?

(b) What was the take up in previous years on professional development offered through the university?

(c) What are the replacement 'vehicles' for internal training?

The answers to these questions were not known and subject to further work by the committee as a means of shedding light upon the need to improve development of faculty.

The anecdotal evidence suggested that the Learning Commons played a significant part in offering options for educational development for faculty. The committee therefore decided that in order to fill at least some of the void created by the recent loss of the Learning Commons, the FDC undertakes to develop a series of workshops on teaching, where we draw on the strengths of existing faculty who have been identified as particularly good teachers, who use innovative pedagogical techniques, and/or make use of innovative technologies in the classroom. It is envisioned that these workshops will provide an opportunity for faculty to share ideas around best practice. To this end, we intend the workshops to be somewhat informal and dialogical, with each workshop to be followed by a social event to further strengthen conversations and collaboration around teaching at Acadia. Strengths of teaching expertise and innovation should be showcased to ALL members of faculty. This is the third recommendation.

4.   Technology

In addition to the development of teaching skills the committee recognized that many students had a better grasp of technology and its application within the classroom than the member of faculty who was teaching. This was seen as a real concern and therefore the committee sees the development of faculty in use of technology within an educational environment as critical to professional competency.

In terms of technology training as a subset of best teaching practice we suggest the use of virtual communities, social media, blogs, ACORN, and integrating technology into teaching styles. The committee recommends that all faculty reach a minimum standard of operational knowledge in these areas.

5.   Development through research.

In regards to Research the first question that the committee sought to answer was 'is this our area?'. If the answer is yes, then do we ask for research as part of professional development to be in areas likely to benefit the university and society rather than unconnected 'novelty' research? The committee seeks to take advice in this area from members of Senate.

Motion from Dr. Vlad Zamlynny, Associate Professor, Chemistry

Rationale: The current curriculum form already has similar questions (#4 and #5) requesting input from students, therefore it seems reasonable to include the opinion of the course instructors as well. Although course instructors usually have better opportunity to participate in curriculum development than students, it is possible that opinions of instructors could not be included.

For example, a regular course instructor can be on a sabbatical or sick leave and the Department can make recommendation without consulting the affected individual. It is also possible that the opinion of the regular course instructor had been negative, but the course modifications were approved by the Department majority and submitted to the upper committees for the final approval. Hence, these questions will make the curriculum modifications *process* more transparent to the university committees that approve them at the upper level (e.g. Heads and Directors, Faculty and Senate Curriculum Committees).

Motion:

To include the following two questions to the "Form 3: Proposed Modification to an existing course":

1. **Has the proposed modification been discussed with the course instructor?**
2. **If yes, does the course instructor approve of the modification?**