

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday, 9 March 2009 beginning at 4:08 p.m. with Chair Ian Wilks presiding and 43 present.

1) Minutes of the Meeting of
9 February 2009

It was moved by R. Perrins and seconded by R. Raeside *that the minutes of Monday, 9 February 2009 be approved as distributed.*

At the request of A. Quéma an amendment was made to page 5, seventh bullet to read “One Senator said that there is no need to rush to create a motion.”

MOTION AS AMENDED WAS CARRIED.

2) Announcements and
Communications
a) From the Chair

-re Regrets

I. Wilks noted regrets from H. Gardner, A. Irving, J. Kirk, R. Lehr, M. MacLeod, G. Ness, M. Snyder, R. Sparkman, M. Trask and A. Vibert.

-re Guests

He welcomed guests N. Carruthers, Acting V-P (Administration) to speak on 3)a); and Ann Dulhanty.

-re Agenda

As there was no objection to waiving notice of motion for an addition to the agenda, the Chair indicated the following would be included, as circulated electronically prior to this meeting: 4)b) Dean, Division of Research and Graduate Studies – Membership of the Senate Research Ethics Board.

The Chair noted that future items to come to Senate included recommendations from an *ad hoc* committee to look at the policy regarding bursaries, and a report for information from Sonya Major on the Connections Program.

-re Correspondence from
Deputy University
Archivist on Senate
Records (089-66-MISC)

I. Wilks read correspondence (**APPENDIX A**) received from Wendy Robicheau, Deputy University Archivist, on the status of Senate Records held in the University Archive. These records were in good order and contained documents from 1882 to the present.

-re Nominating Committee
Annual Responsibilities

I. Wilks noted that it was time for the Senate Nominating Committee to make decisions regarding Senate officers for the coming academic year and prepare a nominating report for circulation in April.

b) From the President (Acting)
& Vice-President
(Academic)
- re Enrolment

T. Herman gave an update on academic program reviews and new initiatives. The proposal for the trans-disciplinary MA in Social and Political Thought has completed its external review and a submission will go to MPHEC. He expressed appreciation to A. Biro and D. MacKinnon for their efforts in this

process.

A second submission was near ready to go to MPHEC on the proposed BA in Environmental Sustainability Studies. Appreciation was expressed to E. Callaghan and many other faculty members for their efforts in this project.

A third proposal was in early stages of development. It was a joint MA/MSc in Health, Culture and Sustainability. D. MacKinnon spoke to this proposed program and said it had been subject to external review prior to coming to Senate. He said that there was nothing in the regulations to indicate when an external review should be done for a program for MPHEC other than it had to be done prior to submission. Thus, by doing it prior to coming to Senate, it is ready. Any changes required by the external review are now in place. The Senate Graduate Studies Committee wishes to bring proposals to Senate in as complete a form as possible.

T. Herman reported on the status of academic program reviews at Acadia University and noted that Physics and Engineering would be completed this term; English & Theatre Studies and Computer Science would be conducted in the Fall 2009; and Languages & Literature and Mathematics & Statistics were scheduled for Winter 2010.

He noted that all first-year students who received a GPA of 3.0 or better in the first term and all those who increased their GPA by one full point over last year were recognized through a letter from the VP (A) Office.

An announcement was expected today from the Federal Minister of Industry regarding upgrades to post-secondary institutions as part of the economic action plan and he was hopeful that AU would benefit from this plan.

He encouraged Senators to attend a lecture this evening offered as part of the Annual Huggins Science Seminar, presenting John C. Vederas of University of Alberta. He also mentioned a successful talk which was part of the BMO Lecture Series in February and given by Scott Travers. He thanked the Department of Economics and the School of Business for organizing these events.

Regarding recruitment, there were several new initiatives underway. A refit of the website will be done in the near future. Major efforts are being made in Ontario, including a display at the Toronto Eaton Centre in partnership with Apple Computer Company during the March break.

T. Herman said the search for Dean of Pure & Applied Science was well underway and site visits planned for April. Also a search for Equity Officer would be launched and until that position was filled would be covered by Terry Lane of the Counselling Centre.

The following was in reply to questions from the floor:

D. MacKinnon noted that cuts to SSHRC were being dealt with internally, but no strategy was set to deal with government cuts at this time. T. Herman said that University Presidents were attempting to have a reversal of these grant cuts to small universities. Meetings have been held with SSHRC, CRC and CFI. He felt it was essential that AU make an annual effort to stay on the radar of these granting organizations to remind them that there is a lot of activity at small universities.

In regards to recruitment in Toronto, T. Herman said that the partnership with

Apple Computers was compatible with what was taking place at AU. Dell Computers was also invited to be part of the display in Toronto, but declined.

Regarding the Foulis Chair, T. Herman explained that this was a chair which was funded by an endowment to the University, specifically for that chair. The terms of this endowment allowed the use of interest only on this fund and with the recent decline in economic markets, it was doubtful there would be sufficient pay-out to fund the chair over the next three years. M. MacVicar said the AU endowments were projected to be down 20 to 25% by the end of the year. She noted that all endowments will be reviewed within the next fiscal year.

T. Herman explained the structure of accountability around enrolment. He said AU has targets which were measured on a weekly basis. The responsibility of recruitment was the office of Vice-President (Advancement) working in conjunction with the manager of recruiting (currently Scott Roberts, acting). To date, the admits were up compared to this time last year, in particular those from Nova Scotia, which indicated that targeting our resources to specific geographic areas and specific groups was appropriate. The conventional wisdom that the conversion rate is fixed from 'interest' to 'applications' to 'admissions' regardless of efforts appears to be wrong. He emphasized that all interest/applications need a follow-up and encouraged faculty members to do so when asked.

The responsibilities of the Acting Equity Officer position have not been set out at this time. Discussion would be held on appropriateness of an external individual/agency taking on these responsibilities. He was open to suggestions. The Incoming President would initiate the search for this position. The desire to have faculty involved in the search for this position was expressed.

3) Business Arising from the Minutes
 a) Censure by Canadian Association of University Teachers (089-65-MISC)

It was moved by P. Williams and seconded by P. Hobson *that whereas censure by the CAUT will substantially undermine the ability of the Academic sector to fulfil its mandate, Senate calls upon the Administration and Board of Governors to act with great urgency to resolve the dispute and avoid the imposition of censure.*"

P. Williams spoke to this motion and said it came from discussion on censure, at the last meeting of Senate. He recognized that the Administration and BOG were aware of the negative and potential implications of censure; however, it was still important to initiate this motion in Senate.

Discussion was held with the following points brought forward:

► In regards to setting a date for action in this motion, I. Wilks felt this would be treading on uncertain ground by asking Administration and BOG for very specific actions. Senate may be overstepping its jurisdiction if we add too many details to our requests.

► N. Carruthers gave an update on the case in question which had resulted in the threatened censure. He said AU had filed its defence in the case today and the next step would be dealing with this legal document in the law courts. He said correspondence had gone to CAUT advising of the action taken and that AU was in a position to have a discussion with them on this case.

► The question as to how relevant this motion was, now that AU had acted upon the issue, was considered. It was noted that the motion records the seriousness and the significance of Senate's concern and was not meant to

condone the action of CAUT. It was part of Senate's responsibilities to state a position on this case publicly.

- ▶ CAUT was giving a deadline before any court proceedings, which one Senator felt was incorrect.
- ▶ The motion was meant to protect the academic sector of this institution.
- ▶ This motion was thoughtful and showed the concern of Senate.
- ▶ This motion was not telling the BOG or Administration to act in a certain way, but generally encouraging them to resolve this urgent issue.
- ▶ This motion came to be in an effort to express the urgency of the situation. Legal action was not the only sort of action which could be taken, especially as legal action would be damaging to AU's reputation. What other response might be undertaken and why has it not been considered?
- ▶ N. Carruthers said that in response to an initial communication by CAUT, a reply went to that body which gave notification that the defence was filed and AU was now in a position for discussion of this issue. No response has been received from CAUT at this time.
- ▶ It was clarified that removal of CAUT censure, was, as so far announced, contingent on the re-instatement of an employee, who they felt, was wrongfully dismissed. But by opening discussion, as was now possible, a resolution of some other kind might occur. This motion asked that that discussion take place.
- ▶ One Senator felt this was a reasonable motion and indicated that Senate considered censure a serious and urgent matter. Now that legal counsel is involved, AU may not be capable of moving with urgency as legal counsel would not move quickly.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

4) New Business

- a) By-Laws Committee –
Terms of Reference of the
Academic Integrity
Committee & Conflict of
Interest Policy
(089-64-LAW)

It was moved by P. Corkum and seconded by A. Quéma *that the Conflict of Interest Policy approved at the November 2008 meeting of Senate (089-11-INT) be withdrawn.*

P. Corkum spoke to this motion as attached to the agenda. She said the Conflict of Interest Policy as approved at the November meeting of Senate provided that appeals be made to the Senate Academic Integrity Committee. After examining the current mandate of this committee, Senate By-Laws Committee did not believe that the Academic Integrity Committee was the appropriate body to deal with appeals. While dealing with this task, comparable policies of conflicts of interest at other universities were reviewed and it was found that they were much more thorough and specific in defining types of conflict of interest and in outlining the different procedures to address a variety of conflicts. A concern was expressed that the AU policy lacks scope by concentrating on a narrowly defined scenario, and that it does not provide adequate procedures to address potential or actual conflicts of interest in domains that were not confined to teaching and student evaluations. In addition, the variety of conflicts of interest makes Senate a major partner in policy-making, but not the sole actor. She said this would be addressed in a second motion from the By-Laws Committee as attached to the agenda.

A. Quéma noted that the attachment to today's agenda included an excerpt from the Policy on Conflict of Interest from Dalhousie University which, compared to the document passed in November, would show that the wording

of the former was precise, non-moralistic, and consistent with a wide range of possible situations. The Dalhousie policy was a better document.

L. Lusby said that there was one university-wide policy on conflict of interest at other institutions compared to a possible situation where AU has one at Human Resources, another at Senate and another at AUFA, which would create the possibility of conflict amongst the various policies.

P. Corkum said that reversing the November decision would not leave AU without a policy on conflict of interest, as the motion was concerned with appeals only. Any issue in the interim would follow the procedure in place prior to the November motion. She recognized that this motion goes beyond the mandate of the By-Laws Committee; however, the Academic Integrity Committee members support this motion.

I. Wilks confirmed that any member at any time may make a motion to rescind a previous motion of Senate.

G. Whitehall recalled that one of the main points of tension during the November discussion was to question whether this was an employment or an academic integrity issue and what was the role of AUFA in matters of this nature. He felt this may be the opportunity to address that question more thoroughly.

Regarding the Dalhousie conflict of interest document, P. Corkum said the language from this document was similar to that used in their collective agreement. It was not clear who was the regulating body, although it seemed this policy originated outside of Senate but was approved and adopted by Senate. There was variety among other policies looked at - one was a university-wide policy from Senate, one was a university-wide policy from the BOG and another from somewhere between BOG and Senate.

A. Quéma said that work on this task was not finished. Senate By-Laws Committee members felt the policy as it stands does not work and thus this is a suggestion in the form of a motion for Senators' consideration. She agreed that there were many different scenarios to consider and said that giving appeals to a Senate committee to deal with would be a mistake. Whatever policy was decided on, the process should include Senators and the policy should come to Senate for approval.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

It was moved by P. Corkum and seconded by L. Lusby *that*

- *an ad hoc university-wide committee structure be proposed by the Vice-President (Academic) by the April 2009 meeting of Senate to produce a thorough and specific conflict of interest policy affecting areas as diverse as research activities, financial contracts, business interests and personal relationships;*
- *this university-wide committee include Senate representatives and other stakeholders from different fields, including Senate representatives, to address the variety of conflicts of interest;*
- *the policy be submitted to Senate for its approval.*

Discussion on this motion included:

► T. Herman indicated his office would be happy and willing to take on this significant undertaking and felt it would involve consultation with a variety of groups on campus.

► A request was made that the proposed *ad hoc* committee structure be approved by Senate.

Four friendly amendments were accepted to change the wording in this motion and are reflected above.

▶ J. White asked if expertise outside of AU, such as Community Representatives on Senate who are knowledgeable in this area, might be considered for this *ad hoc* committee. To which I. Wilks said it was worth consideration.

▶ It was clarified that this motion was asking the VP (A) to come back to Senate with a list of slots for an *ad hoc* committee and a request that various nominating chairs carry out procedures to fill those slots.

▶ It was explained that when this policy comes to Senate for approval, it will do so with the understanding that it is approving the academic portions of that policy. This will be a University Policy.

▶ Representatives on this *ad hoc* committee should be chosen by those they represent.

As we have until the April meeting for Senate to deal with this proposal, P. Corkum encouraged any Senators with a strong interest in this committee or with any ideas on the structure of this committee to contact T. Herman directly rather than waiting until that April meeting to bring forth changes.

MOTION AS AMENDED WAS CARRIED.

b) Dean, Division of Research
and Graduate Studies –
Membership of the Senate
Research Ethics Board
(089-67-REB)

It was moved by D. MacKinnon and seconded by J. White *that on the recommendation of the Chair of the Research Ethics Board and with the approval of the Senate Research Committee (APPENDIX B), Anita Hudak be appointed as a community representative on the Research Ethics Board for the term 1 April 2009 to 30 June 2012.*

The Chair called for further nominations three times and hearing none declared nominations cease.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

5) Adjournment

D. Symons moved this meeting be adjourned. It was 5:50 p.m.

Recently, I took the opportunity to re-examine all of the Senate's records preserved in the Archives. Because these records had been received over many years and through various campus offices, the holdings were disjointed with, what appeared to be, numerous gaps. Fortunately, once all of the received records were examined as a group, I found that the records are fairly complete.

The Archives holds: minutes of the Senate from 1882 to 2001, minutes of various Senate Committees from 1966 to 2006 (including some ad-hoc Committees), and minutes and reports of the Academic Program Review Committee from 1984-2000. All of these records are described on the Library's catalogue and can be found when searching the keywords "Acadia Senate". They are available to researchers.

Not available to researchers, but held by the Archives, are minutes of the Honorary Degrees Committee from 1993-2001 and the Research Ethics Committee records from 1997-2001. These records are not described on the Library's catalogue.

Wendy G. Robicheau

Deputy University Archivist
Vaughan Memorial Library
Acadia University
Wolfville NS B4P 2R6
Canada

Tel 902-585-1731
Fax 902-585-1748
Office VML-B1-218
Email Wendy.Robicheau@acadiau.ca
Library web site <http://library.acadiau.ca>
Archives web site <http://library.acadiau.ca/archives/>
Archival Research Guide <http://libguides.acadiau.ca/archivalresearch/>

FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE MARCH 9TH MEETING OF SENATE:

On the recommendation of the Chair of the Research Ethics Board, and with the approval of the Senate Research Committee, I move that Anita Hudak be appointed as a community representative on the Research Ethics Board for the term 1 April, 2009 to 30 June, 2012.

[Anita is a lawyer with Waterbury Newton in Kentville, where she practices family law, estate planning, and federal criminal prosecutions. Among her many commitments, she sits on the Board of Chrysalis in Kentville. She is a graduate of the University of New Brunswick and Memorial University of Newfoundland.]

David MacKinnon, Ph.D.
Acting Dean
Research and Graduate Studies