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 9:00 am on Wednesday, 9 May 2012 in BAC 132.

The agenda follows:

Morning Session: 9:00 - 11:30 am

1) Approval of Agenda

2) Minutes of the Meeting of 9 April 2012

3) Announcements

4) Time-sensitive Items

   a) Approval of the List of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2012 (*to be circulated*)

   b) Nominating Committee: Senate Vacancies (*attached*)

5) Discussion Items

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

   b) Report from the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (*written report to follow*)

   > *Note*: Will require a decision by Senate. Should the APPC be disbanded? Converted to a standing committee? Continue as an ad hoc committee? In the same form, or modified form?

   > *Motion*: "The APPC requests from Senate a one-month extension of its mandate in order to provide a set of options for academic planning at Acadia University".

   c) Discussion of Town Hall Data presented by Vice-President Academic (*previously circulated)*

Lunch Break 11:30 am - 12:00 pm (lunch will be provided)

Afternoon Session: 12:00 - 2:00 pm:

6) Brought forward from 9 April 2012

   a) Motion from the Honours Committee (*attached*)

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

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

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

   e) Motion from the Chair, Senate Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning regarding change in committee membership *(attached)*

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

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

7) New Business

   a) Senate Chair's Report on Budget Advisory Committee and Academic Resources Committee (*verbal)*

   b) Senate Committee Annual Reports (*attached*)
      i.   Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning (2011-2012)
      ii. Committee on Graduate Studies (2011-2012)
      iii. Research Committee (2011-2012)
      iv. Honours Committee (2011-2012)
      v.   Research Ethics Board (2011-2012)
      vi. Library Committee (2011-2012)
      vii. Executive Committee (2011-2012)
      viii. Honorary Degrees Committee (2011-2012)
      ix. Academic Integrity Committee (2011-2012
      x.   Archives Committee (2011-2012)
      xi. Faculty Development Committee (2010-2011)

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED
Rosemary Jotcham
Registrar and Secretary of Senate

Nominations Committee Report
9 May 2012

Senate and Senate Committee Nominations
for 2012-2013

The following is a list of nominees for Senate committees to be voted on at the 9 May 2012 meeting of Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Corbett
Nominations Committee Chair

Chair: 2012-2013 (1 year)

- **replacing Diane Holmberg**

NOMINEE: DIANE HOLMBERG

Deputy-Chair: 2012-2013 (1 year)

- **replacing Paul Doerr**

NOMINEE: PAUL DOERR

Faculty Elections Officer: 2012-2013 (1 year)

- **replacing Paula Rockwell**

NOMINEE: BRENDA TROFENENKO

Representatives on the Senate Executive: 2012-2013 (1 year)

- **replacing Jeff Hennessy (Arts)**

NOMINEE: JEFF HENNESSY

- **replacing Shelley MacDougall (Professional Studies)**

NOMINEE: SHELLEY MACDOUGALL

- **replacing Marlene Snyder (Pure and Applied Science)**

NOMINEE: ANDY MITCHELL

Representative on the University Senate: 2012-2015 (3 years)

- **replacing Wendy Elliott (lay person)**

NOMINEE: BARRY LESLIE

Replacements on the By-Laws Committee:
- Vacant (Senator ~Professional Studies): 2011-2014 (3 years)

NOMINEE: TBA
- **replacing Barb Anderson (Senator ~ Pure and Applied Science): 2012-2015 (3 years)**

NOMINEE: BARB ANDERSON

Replacements on the Research Ethics Board:
- **replacing J. Boutilier (Community member with no affiliation with Acadia University and not currently engaged in scientific, legal, or academic work): 2012-2015 (3 years):**

NOMINEE: Joan Boutilier
- **replacing A. Hudak (Community member who has legal knowledge but with no affiliation with Acadia University): 2012-2015 (3 years)**

NOMINEE: Anita Hudak

Replacement on the Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning Committee:
- **replacing Marlene Snyder (Senator ~ Science): 2012-2015 (3 years)**

NOMINEE: SONYA MAJOR
- replacing Janice Best (Senator ~ Arts): *on sabbatical leave 1 Jan 2013 ~ 30 June 2013*

NOMINEE: TBA
- **replacing Michael Corbett (Senator ~ Professional Studies):** *on sabbatical leave 1 Jan 2013 ~ 30 June 2013*

NOMINEE: LYNN AYLWARD

Replacement on the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee:
- **replacing Darren Kruisselbrink (Senator – Chair): 2012-2014**

NOMINEE: JOHN GUINEY YALLOP

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):** Head count 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). FCE is determined as above. Non-credit 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.

Motion from the Dean of Research & Graduate Studies, on behalf of the Chair of the Senate Honours Committee:

That the current By-law concerning membership on the Senate Honours Committee be modified as follows:

"The members of the Senate Honours Committee shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. And shall be as follows:

The Dean of Research & Graduate Studies or delegate (ex officio)
The Registrar or delegate (Ex officio) **(Non-voting)**
Two members from the Faculty of Arts
Two members from the Faculty of Professional Studies
Two members from the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
One Honours student (Arts)
One Honours Student (Professional Studies)
One Honours student (Pure & Applied Science)

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. <u>Non-staggered committee memberships</u>
       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. Senator composition Senate Committee Students with Disabilities that affect Learning (SCSDAL)

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

Motion from the Chair, Senate Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning

That the current By-law concerning membership of the Senate Committee on Students with Disabilities that affect Learning be modified as follows:

"The membership of the Senate Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:
The Academic Support Coordinator or delegate
The Disability Resource Facilitator or delegate
The Registrar or delegate
One ~~Senator~~ **member** from the Faculty of Arts
One ~~Senator~~ **member** from the Faculty of Professional Studies
One ~~Senator~~ **member** from the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science
One ~~Senator or delegate~~ **member** from the Faculty of Theology
One student appointed by the Student Representative Council"

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?**

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.

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).

Senate Committee on Graduate Studies
Annual Report to Senate
May, 2012

Committee members:

Aylward, L. (Educational Studies)	Mendivil, F. (Mathematics & Statistics)
Barr, S. (Geology)	Murimboh, J. / McFarland, S. (Chemistry)
Biro, A. (Social & Political Thought)	Quinn, D. (graduate student, FPAS)
Brickner, R. (Political Science)	Spooner, I. (Applied Geomatics)
Corbett, M. (Education)	Symons, D. / Price, L. (Psychology)
Dueck, N, (graduate student, Arts)	Trudel, A. (Computer Science)
Evans, R. (Biology)	Wyile, H. / Rigg, P. (English)
Horgan, M. (Sociology)	[vacant] (graduate student, FPS)
MacKinnon, D. (Chair; R&GS)	

Business:

The Senate Committee on Graduate Studies met on three occasions during the 2011-2012 academic year: 26 September, 7 December, and 18 April. Regular (non-problematic) business was conducted electronically throughout the year.

The business that came before the Committee this year included the following:

- Curriculum changes and program modifications to graduate programs in Computer Science, Political Science, and Psychology.
- Approval for graduate students to submit back-to-back theses (optional).
- Development of a policy document on graduate supervision (see below).
- Streamlining of procedures for registering in graduate courses.
- Modifications to the process for awarding AGAs: (a) allocation by the Dean of R&GS to Faculties in February/March; (b) departmental/school allocations established by Faculty coordinators; (c) funds unallocated prior to August 31 to remain within the Faculty and reassigned according to agreement among the Faculty coordinators; and (d) funds unallocated after August 31 to revert to the AGA Subcommittee for reallocation recommendation to the committee of coordinators.
- Establishment of GPA requirements for graduate admission from selected international countries.
- Minor modification to the Leave of Absence policy.
- Development of policy on adjunct professors serving as external examiners (in progress)

Thesis Supervision Subcommittee

During the 2010-1011 academic year, the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies established a subcommittee to develop a policy/procedures document on the supervision of graduate students.

The mandate of the Subcommittee was to examine policies and procedures across campus concerning thesis guidelines and processes, with a particular focus on the nature of the supervisory relationship. Where available, the Subcommittee examined published guidelines from departments and schools at Acadia, as well as policies and procedures from other Canadian universities. The work of the Subcommittee concluded in the fall of 2011, with recommendations to the Committee at its December meeting. With the approval of the Committee, coordinators took the draft to their units for discussion and recommendations for changes. The document was approved by Senate, with minor modifications, at its meeting on 9 April, 2012.

Submitted by:

David MacKinnon
Chair
Senate Committee on Graduate Studies

**Senate Research Committee
Annual Report to Senate
May 2012**

Committee members:

Abou Zahra, M. (Arts)   Jha, A. (Pure & Applied Science)
Brackney, W. (Theology)   MacKinnon, D. (Dean, R&GS; *ex officio*)
Chipman, H. (Canada Research Chair)   Perrins, R. / Moody, B. (Research Centre)
Colton, J. (Professional Studies)   Robicheau, W. (Library/Archives)
Dueck, N. (Graduate student)   Sweet, S. (Honours student)

The Senate Research Committee met on three occasions: 13 October, 9 January, and 28 February. The work of the Committee was focused in three areas:

- The design of a process for regular reviews of Acadia's Strategic Research Plan
- The design and development of an event to celebrate research at Acadia
- The development of grant writing workshops to support research funding applications

Strategic Research Plan (SRP)

Focus: The Committee approved a draft process for conducting annual reviews of the University's Strategic Research Plan, which includes: (a) the establishment of guiding principles; (b) the development a SRP baseline database; (c) a call for input from the campus community; (d) focus group interviews with faculty representatives, senior administrators, directors of research centres, Canada Research Chairs, and undergraduate and graduate students; and (e) an open forum within each faculty on the draft SRP.

Status: On the agenda of the May meeting of Senate

Research Celebration

Focus: The Committee is planning a day-long event to celebrate research at Acadia. However, rather than repeating last year's Research Summit, the Committee felt that the event should change annually, so as not to become predictable and flat. To that end, the intention this is year is to focus on Acadia's many community- and industry-based research collaborations. The day will feature two events: (a) an open showcase of interactive displays, and (b) panel discussions involving Acadia faculty and representatives from communities and industries, focused in four activity areas: tidal energy, agri-food, health and wellness, and diversity.

Status: Deferred to the fall of 2012

Mentoring Workshops

Focus: Phase I of the mentoring workshops was established in the fall of 2011. Known as the Critical Colleagues Program, the focus was on matching Tri-Council applicants, on a voluntary basis, with an internal critical advisor. The advisors worked with applicants in the development of their 2011 applications. Phase II of this program has three components: 1) a one-day grant writing workshop conducted by Dr. Dawn McArthur, Senior Research Development Facilitator with the Child and Family Research Institute in British Columbia; 2) three half-day intensive workshops, focused exclusively on Tri-Council applications, involving internal mentors and successful grant writers; 3) the development of a strong draft application by each participant to be submitted for external review in late July.

Status: In progress
One-day workshop:　June 8
Half-day workshops:　June 11, June 25, July 9

Respectfully submitted,

David MacKinnon
Chair, Senate Research Committee

Honours Committee

Annual Report for 2011-2012

Committee Members 2011-2012

David MacKinnon, Dean of Research and Graduate Studies (*ex officio*)
Robert Seale, English and Theatre, Faculty of Arts
Shilpa Dogra, Kinesiology, Faculty of Professional Studies
Kelly Dye, Business, Faculty of Professional Studies
Pritam Ranjan, Mathematics and Statistics, Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences (Chair)
Amitabh Jha, Chemistry, Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences
Sarah Sweet, Honours Student (Environmental Science)
Camille Cramm, Honours Student (Kinesiology)
Kyle Power, Honours Student (Political Science)
Susann Hudson, English and Theatre, Faculty of Arts

Summary of meetings in 2011-2012: We met four times last year. One meeting was cancelled because we could not meet the quorum requirements.

1. November 25, 2011: The former chair Sonia Hewitt had to discontinue due to her sabbatical. The main purpose of this meeting was to welcome the new members and choose a new chair. After lot of convincing, I agreed to serve as the chair.

2. December 13, 2011: We started discussing the summary of the Honours forum held on April 5 and 6, 2011. Based on the forum summary, it appeared that the value of the external reader for the honours theses under the current system is questionable and should perhaps be changed. According to the current guidelines, the external readers are supposed to review the presentation of mechanical matters (such as style, format, grammar, spelling), as well as for structure, logic, consistency, and clarity of argument. The Committee is currently discussing possible changes to recommend to Senate.

3. February 08, 2012: We discussed the possibility of using a thesis template to save the time and effort of the external readers in checking the style and formatting of the theses. The expertise of the external readers can perhaps be used more efficiently by choosing the reviewers carefully (e.g., in cognate department) and allowing them to provide more thorough reviews on the theses. This is currently under discussion.

4. April 12, 2012: The Honours Committee decided to pursue the idea of providing department/school-wise thesis templates (not just guidelines) for the honours students. We also realized that the current HSRA adjudication process is slightly *ad-hoc* and may vary from year to year depending on the adjudication committee. Consequently, are exploring ways of standardizing the adjudication process and will be bringing forward recommendations to Senate in the fall.

Honours thesis: This year the Committee received and approved 75 submissions. We thank all the faculty members on campus for volunteering as external readers for reading one or more honours theses.

Plan for 2012-2013: We intend to develop the thesis templates by the end of the summer, and include the evaluation criteria on the HSRA application form and poster. Next year, the committee would like to go over the honours forum report and discuss each item mentioned in the report (e.g., role of external reader, proposal for the thesis, grading scheme and so on).

Finally, I would like to thank all members of the Committee for their hard work.

Respectfully submitted,

Pritam Ranjan
Chair, Senate Honours Committee

To: Acadia University Senate

From: S. Maitzen, Chair, Research Ethics Board
Date: 30 April 2012
Re: **Annual Report of the Research Ethics Board**

For the period 1 May 2011 to 30 April 2012:

REB members
Dr. Joan Boutilier, Community Member
Dr. William H. Brackney, Faculty Representative, Theology (to 31 August 2011)
Dr. Tracy Demmons, Faculty Representative, Theology (1 September 2011–17 January 2012)
Dr. David F. Duke, Faculty Representative, Arts
Mr. Jim Ghoshdastidar, Graduate Student Representative (to 30 June 2011)*
Dr. Diane Holmberg, Faculty Representative, Pure and Applied Science (to 30 June 2011)
Ms. Anita Hudak, Community Member
Dr. David MacKinnon, Dean, Research and Graduate Studies (*ex officio*)*
Dr. Stephen Maitzen, Chair
Ms. Crystal Sweeney, Graduate Student Representative (from 1 February 2012)*
Dr. Susan Potter, Faculty Representative, Pure and Applied Science (from 1 July 2011)
Dr. Christopher Shields, Faculty Representative, Professional Studies (to 30 June 2011)
Dr. Brenda Trofanenko, Faculty Representative, Professional Studies (from 1 July 2011)

*non-voting

Applications and meetings: During the reporting period, the REB reviewed 96 new formal applications for ethics approval, as well as numerous formal requests from researchers to approve changes to previously approved research. The REB met on 10 occasions during this period.

Other activities: The REB's Chair and Faculty Representatives responded to numerous informal inquiries from student and faculty researchers at Acadia and elsewhere. The Chair serves as the University's liaison to the national Secretariat for Research Ethics, prepares and distributes the agendas for meetings, records the minutes at meetings and distributes them for approval, writes letters of ethics approval or rejection, performs all filing and maintenance of records, follows up on unapproved research, reviews annual reports from department-level ethics committees, publicizes the role and requirements of the REB, maintains the REB website, and reports to Senate and other bodies concerning the business of the REB.

Training of members: Each newly appointed REB member receives a detailed written orientation from the REB Chair describing the new member's duties and the REB's procedures.

Ad hoc advisors: Ad hoc advisors are appointed only when the REB judges that it lacks the knowledge needed to review a particular application. None were required during the reporting period.

Appeals: None

Complaints: None

Guidance sought from the national Secretariat for Research Ethics: None

Matters out of the ordinary: None

Other comments: (1) The REB's current terms of reference are satisfactory, although the REB is grateful to Senate for reducing the quorum requirement to 4 voting members (including at least one community member) until a representative from the Faculty of Theology is appointed and proves able to attend meetings. (2) The REB has no objection to filing its report with Senate each May, as has been the REB's practice since its establishment in 1999. (3) The REB meets regularly on dates that are publicly announced; no changes are required in this regard.

SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT – MAY 9, 2012

Membership
Sara Lochhead (University Librarian ex-officio), Gillian Poulter (Chair), Ann Smith (Professional Librarian), Mervyn Horgan (FA), Leigh Whaley (FA), Kendra Carmichael (FPS), David Piper (FPS), Holgar Teismann (FPAS), Martin Tango (FPAS), Glenn Wooden (FT), Kyle Power (ASU, VPA), Colin Deal (Student), Jessica Sinclair (Grad Student); Robert Seale (FA – Sabbatical replacement), Paul Callaghan (FA – Sabbatical replacement).

Mandate
For the benefit of new and returning members of the Committee, the first meeting began with a review of the terms of reference as stipulated by Senate's Constitution. The purpose of the committee is to offer a conduit through which academic concerns regarding the library may be conveyed, and to address those concerns by various means, including advocacy and the formulation of policy recommendations.

Meetings and Issues
Two meetings were held in academic year 2011-12. Issues discussed were as follows:
   a. Erin Patterson, Academic Librarian, was invited to attend the meeting on February 14, 2012 to update the committee regarding the situation with Access Copyright. The Committee will continue to monitor this issue.
   b. The Committee looked over the Library's Collection Development Policy (approved by Senate November 12, 2006), and determined that it was time to update and review the document. The Research Services Sector has been asked to initiate this review and to provide the SLC with a draft document by October 31, 2012.
   c. The Committee provided feed-back to Ann Smith, the Professional Librarian representative, regarding the formulation of an Open Access Policy for Acadia. This will be another on-going issue for 2012-13.
   d. The Committee considered the questions asked by the Chair of Senate and came to the following conclusions:
      1. The Committee serves an important role as a place where policy recommendations on collection development and support for research are reviewed, as well as dealing with all library related concerns brought forward by faculty, librarians and students. We considered whether it would be feasible to amalgamate with the Archives Committee and concluded that the interests of the two committees are separate and distinct. We therefore do not recommend any changes to the terms of reference or membership.
      2. May is the appropriate time for the Committee to submit the annual report.
      3. The Chair is appointed by Senate, so there are no procedural problems regarding calling regular meetings.

Recommendations
The Committee has no recommendations to make at the current time.

Respectfully submitted,

Gillian Poulter
Chair

Senate Executive

Annual Report for 2011-2012

Committee Members 2011-2012

>Donna Seamone, Chair (Fall term)

>Diane Holmberg, Chair (Winter term)

>Diane Holmberg, Deputy Chair (Fall term)

>Paul Doerr, Deputy Chair (Winter term)

>Ray Ivany, President

>Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic

>Robert Perrins, Dean of Arts (Fall term)

>Barry Moody, Acting Dean of Arts (Winter term)

>Peter Williams, Dean of Science

>Heather Hemming, Dean of Professional Studies (Fall term)

>Glyn Bissix, Acting Dean of Professional Studies (Winter term)

>David MacKinnon, Dean of Research and Graduate Studies

>Harry Gardner, Dean of Theology

>Rosemary Jotcham, Registrar

>Kyle Power, Student Vice-President Academic

>Jeff Hennessey, Arts Senator

>Shelley MacDougall, Professional Studies Senator

>Marlene Snyder, Science Senator

Summary of Activities

The committee met on two occasions: September 1 and November 28.

It was agreed at the September meeting that four meetings would be held this year, one at the beginning and one at the end of each term. D. Seamone held the Fall term meetings. D. Holmberg asked if there were any agenda items necessitating a meeting early in the Winter term. As none were forthcoming, no meeting was held at the beginning of the Winter term. One will be held at the end of this term, and plans for next year's meeting schedule will be discussed.

Upcoming agenda items were discussed at each meeting. In addition, discussions were held in the September meeting regarding Senate Committee reporting procedures. Some committees are not reporting regularly to Senate. Also, May might not be the optimal time to receive reports from all committees, and spreading out the annual reports might allow more time for discussion. At the September meeting, it was proposed that D. Seamone, T. Herman, and R. Jotcham would meet to discuss Senate Committee cycles and bring the issue back to Senate Executive and then to Senate. After the transition of the Chairs, D. Holmberg proposed instead to gather input from current committees as part of their annual report regarding what their committee's optimal reporting schedule would be; this plan was mentioned during announcements at Senate and has been implemented for this annual reporting cycle.

At the November meeting, the Chair of the TTTCAC attended and reported that the committee continued to face challenges in conducting its position rankings because they lacked an overall framework of academic priorities. Discussion centred on the progress of the ad hoc APPC, which had been formed in response to earlier calls by the TTTCAC for an overall set of academic priorities. Members who were on the APPC reported that committee was struggling to define its mandate, and to decide on its scope (e.g., should it solely be gathering information, or should it be making recommendations to Senate). D. Seamone, as Chair of Senate, was invited to attend a meeting of the APPC to discuss its scope and mandate.

The May reporting time works well for the Senate Executive Committee, to provide an overview of the past year's activities. The Chair will continue to call a meeting of the Executive Committee in September of each year, to discuss meeting schedules and plans for the upcoming year.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Holmberg, Chair

HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE

Annual Report for 2011-2012

May 2012

Committee Members 2011-2012:

Mr. Ray Ivany, President & Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
Dr. Harry Gardner, President, Acadia Divinity College
Dr. Zelda Abramson, Faculty of Arts Representative
Dr. Roxanne Seaman, Faculty of Professional Studies Representative
Dr. Anthony Tong, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science Representative
Ms. Janet Kirk, Board of Governors Representative
Mr. Ben Jessome, Acadia Student's Union Representative
Ms. Janny Postema, Recording Secretary

The Purpose of the Committee is to:

1. Invite nominations for Honorary Doctorate degrees and Professores, Librarian, and Archivists Emeriti awards.
2. Adjudicate the nominations; and
3. Recommend nominees thereon to Senate.

Meetings 2011-2012:

July 25, 2011
December 13, 2011
January 18, 2012
February 2, 2012

Summary of Committee Activities:

The Committee forwarded to Senate for a vote by secret ballot a total of two Honorary Degrees and six Professor Emeritus nominations of which two Honorary Degrees and six Professor Emeritus received approval by Senate.

The draft Terms of Reference and Guidelines proposed by the Committee were approved by Senate at its September 2011 meeting.

Recommendation:

That the name of the Committee be changed from "Honorary Degrees Committee" to *"Awards Committee for Honorary Degrees and Emeriti Distinction (Awards Committee)".*

I would like to thank members of the Awards Committee (Dr. Zelda Abramson, Dr. Harry Gardner, Mr. Ben Jessome, Ms. Janet Kirk, Dr. Roxanne Seaman, and Dr. Anthony Tong) for their work over the past year.

Respectfully submitted by the Chair,

Raymond E. Ivany
President & Vice-Chancellor

Annual Report to Senate from the Academic Integrity Committee

April 26, 2012

Committee Membership:
Patricia Rigg, Emma Cochrane, Robert Pitter, Martin Tango, Rosemary Jotcham

The Senate Academic Integrity Committee met on April 12, 2012. The Committee reviewed its mandate and outstanding items from previous meetings.

Submissions from unit heads regarding their approach to academic integrity had previously been received and reviewed. It was clear from these submissions that units have developed procedures to deal with academic misconduct that best fit their discipline.

The need for the Committee to continue was discussed by the members. It was felt that, although academic integrity is an important subject, the Committee itself may not be required.

The Registrar circulates information to faculty each fall reminding them to stress the importance of the issue and the consequences of academic misconduct to their students and to report any issues of misconduct that arise. The Registrar maintains the list of academic offenders. This information is not shared with the Committee for reasons of confidentiality, but a brief summary could be provided to Senate each year by the Registrar.

Any additional policy requirements related to academic integrity could be undertaken by the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (Policy).

It was therefore suggested by the members that the Committee be dissolved.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Committee,
Rosemary Jotcham

Senate Archives Committee Annual Report (2011-2012)

Background:

The Senate Archives Committee has been without a Chair and Secretary since 2009. As a result, the Committee has not met in the past three years. Although inactive, the Committee membership has continued to be filled with representatives from the student body, faculty, University administration, general research community, and Baptist community.

In 2011, discussions were held concerning the status of this Committee and the possibility of merging with the Senate Library Committee. At that time it was agreed that the Senate Archives Committee and the Senate Library Committee should remain separate.

Recommendations:

1.   The Senate Archives Committee remain separate from the Senate Library Committee.

2.   The Senate Archives Committee should be rejuvenated.

Report from the Faculty Development Committee.

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.