Dear Member of Senate:

I advise you that a meeting of the Senate of Acadia University will occur at 4:00 pm on Monday, 11 March 2013 in BAC 132.

The agenda follows:

1) Approval of Agenda

2) Minutes of the Meeting of 11th February, 2013

3) Announcements *(normally 10 minutes per speaker)*

4) **Time-Sensitive Issues:**

   a) Honorary Degree and Professor Emeritus Nominations

5) **Carried forward from 11th February, 2013**

   a) Annual Review of the Functioning of the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee (*attached*)

   b) Report from Senate Honours Committee regarding Honours Forum (*attached*)

6) **New Business**

   a) Motions from the By-Laws Committee regarding Senate Committee Membership (*attached*)

   b) Minors on Transcripts – discussion item

   c) Motion from the Academic Planning Committee regarding endorsement of a renewed articulation of "An Acadia Education" as a planning goal (*attached*)

7) **Other Business**

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED
Rosie Hare
Secretary of Senate

FEBRUARY 2013 REPORT FROM THE TTTCAC

This is a report on the TTTCAC's activities since November 2012. Most of the activities revolved around a decision that Senate took last spring.

CONTEXT
- In June 2012, Senate approved the motion that the By-Law describing the mandate and operating procedure of the TTTCAC would be revised. The terms of the motion (moved by D. Kruisselbrink and seconded by R. Murphy) were as follows:

1. The TTTCAC shall gather relevant data from the Registrar and circulate it to Deans, Directors, Heads and program coordinators, on an annual basis, by May 31.

2. Units shall submit position requests to the Chair of the TTTCAC, and copied to the relevant Dean "*and the Vice-President Academic*"[DB], along with a one/two line rationale justified by demonstrated need, by June 15.

3. If the Vice-President Academic has notified the Chair of the TTTCAC, by June 30 of a given year, that tenure-track searches will be authorized:
a. Units shall complete a formal request which shall be submitted to Dean of their faculty.
b. Each faculty shall submit a ranked list to the Chair of the TTTCAC by September 1.
c. The TTTCAC shall complete its ranking process and submit the ranked list to the Vice-President Academic by September 15.

4. If the Vice-President Academic has notified the Chair of the TTTCAC, by June 30 of a given year, that tenure-track searches will not be authorized:
a. The TTTCAC will report the list of requests to Senate at its September meeting.

- On the recommendation of Diane Holmberg, Chair of Senate, a second motion was carried that "Senate approve a temporary exception to the By-Laws to enable the TTTCAC to follow the new procedures while the TTTCAC consults with the By-Laws Committee regarding the required changes to the By-Laws" (moved by R. Murphy, seconded by B. Anderson).

ACTIVITIES
- On November 13, the Chair of the TTTCAC worded revisions and circulated them by email to the Committee.
- On November 26, the Committee reached a consensus on the revised wording. However, a member of the Committee also proposed a different approach to the ranking process.
- On December 14, the TTTCAC met to discuss this new proposal. In the course of the discussion, yet another proposal emerged. The outcome of this meeting was that the Deans would consult their respective faculties to discuss this proposal.
- On December 18, the Chair circulated the minutes of the meeting to the Committee.
- On 31 January 2013, P. Dimock provided the data from the Registrar's Office.

Anne Quéma, chair of the TTTCAC

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)

FROM the SENATE BY-LAWS COMMITTEE TO SENATE

March 11, 2013

Committee Members:
Heather A. Kitchin (Arts), Chair
Barb Anderson (Science), Secretary
William Brackney (Theology)
Jim MacLeod (Professional Studies)

The Senate By-Laws Committee has been tasked with assessing: [a] whether there are currently too many Senate Standing Committees; and [b] whether the membership requirements for some of the Committees can be streamlined in size.

Given the breadth of Senate Committees, the reduced number of full-time faculty, plus larger class sizes (resulting in greater commitments elsewhere), the number of committees and the required committee complements is being evaluated, through an iterative process, by the Senate By-Laws Committee.

As a first step in this incremental process, and only after extensive consideration of these issues, the Senate By-Laws Committee proposes the following two motions:

1. Be it resolved that representation on all Standing Senate Committees be limited to one member per faculty, unless otherwise indicated in a formal response showing a clear rationale that a more robust membership is required to carry of the mandate and duties required of the committee. Written responses may be submitted to the Chair of the By-Laws Committee on or before May 31, 2013.

2. Be it resolved that, while remaining a 'Committee' and maintaining its current delineation of duties, and its reporting structure to Senate, the Senate Timetable, Instruction Hours and Examination Committee, be constituted solely by the Registrar, or the Registrar's delegate.

Motion from Academic Planning Committee

In an effort to help guide academic and institutional planning moving forward, the APC grounded its initial planning considerations in the University Strategic Plan. The plan was used by the APC to identify and articulate an overarching goal or 'end state' to which our planning efforts would be oriented. In its considerations, the APC was particularly drawn to the Mission statement and the description of "An Acadia Education". While the APC found that the Mission remains relevant, compelling and current, the APC also concluded that it needed to explicitly identify the key components of an Acadia Education, as these were considered to be at the heart of the APC's efforts. The APC felt that the best way to do this was through a re-statement and expansion of the existing description. Consequently, the APC offers this renewed articulation of an "Acadia Education" (as presented in Appendix A of the APC Report to Senate, Feb 11, 2013) and submits it in the form of a tangible end state and goal for all of the university to strive towards. The APC respectfully requests that Senate endorses this submission.

A. An Acadia education:

1.   Is rigorous and liberal and requires students to gain knowledge and understanding across and within disciplines.
2.   Focuses on the whole student and fosters healthy academic, social, and residential experiences to develop well-rounded critical thinkers, engaged citizens, and lifelong learners.

B. To accomplish this, an Acadia education:

1.   Is personalized in that students and faculty build close educational relationships that foster critical thinking, deep understanding, and attitudes of lifelong learning.
2.   Encompasses a variety of curricular and extracurricular experiences that develop engagement with community and society on the principles of modern citizenship, ethical decision-making, and accountability.
3.   Emphasises the importance of understanding the environment in all its forms.
4.   Promotes student participation in research in order to enhance their critical thinking and analytical reasoning and to foster their understanding that research plays a crucial role in the growth and development of all aspects of our world.

T. Herman, Chair, APC
March 4, 2013