

Office of the Senate Secretariat

Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia
Canada B0P 1X0

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



Minutes of the Senate meeting of Monday 10th March, 2014

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 10th March, 2014 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 49 present, plus two guests.

1) Approval of Agenda

The Chair stated that before the agenda could be approved there were some changes to be requested.

S. Major wished to add a motion to defer curriculum changes that had been approved at the last Senate meeting for the Psychology Department. This would be added as item 4)c) right below the other curriculum changes. The Chair noted that because this request had been circulated by e-mail but did not meet the Notice of Motion requirements, an absolute majority of Senators would need to approve making this addition to the agenda. This would require 27 Senators to be in favour.

There were no objections to waiving the Notice of Motion and adding this item to the agenda. Items below were now renumbered to 4)d) - 4)f).

Motion to approve the agenda as revised. Moved by B. Perrins, seconded by A. Smith.

P. Doerr asked whether item 4)f) *Professor Emeriti Nominations* could be moved up to 4)d) to ensure that it was covered during the Senate meeting. There were no objections.

AGENDA APPROVED AS AMENDED.

2) Minutes of the Meeting of 10th February, 2014

Motion to approve the minutes of February 10th, 2014. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by A. Smith.

H. Wylie requested that text be added on Page 7. After the words "*H. Wylie agreed that this was a shortcoming of the motion, but that it was coming before Senate because Senate was the appropriate legislative body, and had representatives from a variety of relevant sectors*", he suggested that the following words be added: "*He also noted that the motion had arisen through discussion with numerous colleagues*". There were no objections to this addition.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS REVISED CARRIED.

3) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

The Chair noted regrets from J. MacLeod, D. MacKinnon, B. Hagerman, J. Whidden and P. Connelly.

The Chair welcomed S. Hewitt who was replacing P. Hobson on Senate. Also a welcome was extended to S. Mesheau, the new VP Recruitment and Student Services.

The Chair noted that J. Hooper was attending from the APC. Melissa Scanlan was a guest of Ann Smith from the Library (for the LibQual presentation).

There were no objections to the guests attending.

The Chair reported that she had attended a Budget Advisory Committee meeting on behalf of Senate. The 2014-2015 projected deficit was quite large, due partly to the unresolved Pension issue.

The Chair met with the By-Laws committee, discussion of which would be covered later in the Senate meeting.

b) From the President

President Ivany reported that the largest Experience Acadia Day to date had been held the previous Friday, and thanked colleagues that were directly involved with the event. Almost 250 interested students attended the event. President Ivany noted that although it was early in the enrolment cycle at this stage, the numbers in the application pool were looking much the same as last year and stressed the importance of conversion into registered students. President Ivany pointed out the diversity of the student body, as over fifty different countries were represented, which was the result of a prudent strategy by the recruitment office. He was particularly pleased that the GPA of students has not declined and that the number of top scholarship students had also increased considerably. President Ivany was pleased that Acadia had experienced a 24% enrolment increase over the last five years with no erosion in either the quality or the 'fit' between incoming students and Acadia's model of undergraduate education.

President Ivany referred again to the Ontario initiative around differentiation that he felt the APC may want to consider. He felt that this will have implications for the Nova Scotia context. The government in Ontario did take it into government policy and President Ivany encouraged Senators to read the public documents. Despite the speculation that the initiative may lose momentum depending on the results of the next Ontario election, President Ivany felt it was likely that differentiation would become part of the Nova Scotia PSE debate in the next three to five years.

G. Whitehall asked President Ivany to explain how Acadia recruits students into specific programs, and what strategies Acadia might use to recruit students into programs that were struggling, instead of directing students towards already strong programs.

President Ivany responded that this was more D. Youden and J. Darnbrough's area, but that he knew that strategies were being used to encourage students to enter under-subscribed programs. President Ivany stated that recruiters were briefed carefully, but that a challenge was that the North American trend was for students to continue to want to hear about the very programs that were over-subscribed. Although low enrolment in some programs could be seen to be cyclical, President Ivany acknowledged that, in recent years, there was a move away from the Liberal Arts by graduating High School students.

President Ivany felt that Acadia had taken a bold step in continuing to

promote the Liberal Arts tradition at Acadia and holding to the belief that this was an essential element of the university.

c) From the Vice-President Academic

T. Herman stated that Acadia was working on discipline specific recruiting and strategies to address the issue raised by G. Whitehall. An important trend that was being seen on both the national and international level was a view that the world of Liberal Arts has become disconnected with the world of work. T. Herman felt that Acadia needed to re-establish that connection and one way in which this was being done was by creating a Coop Officer responsible for dealing specifically with Coop possibilities in the Faculty of Arts and with the workforce.

T. Herman reminded Senators that the ASU Leadership Awards night was coming soon and that nominations for a series of awards were being sought. T. Herman asked Senators to take a nomination form and nominate students for awards by March 15th.

T. Herman stated that yesterday he was privileged to attend a ceremony in the Philosophy Department to remember Matt Kohlenberg, who died tragically last summer. Matt was a very promising Honours student in the Philosophy program. Matt's parents had created an award to honour Matt's memory, and this was awarded to the first recipient, Colton Heiberg, a student who embodied the same qualities as Matt.

G. Whitehall asked T. Herman when he would report to Senate on how the CLTs were distributed for 2014-2015 and the rationale for those decisions.

T. Herman agreed that he could report later in the season.

The Chair noted for the record that there was no requirement to report this information to Senate, but T. Herman was most welcome to do so.

A. Quema asked President Ivany how programs like the IDST Women and Gender Studies were represented when Acadia was recruiting and noted that representatives could promote Science in connection with women in science. A. Quema also asked about the recent Experience Acadia Day presentations at the Festival Theatre, where two young men spoke well to the potential students, but their presentations were not balanced by women presenters.

President Ivany responded that the reason these two recruiters gave the presentation was because these are the recruiters for most of the Maritime area. This meant that many of the students in the audience would have previously met the two recruiters and been recruited by them. The first speaker in the event was Alanna Fairfax, who was a top student in Science. President Ivany agreed with A. Quema that reminding students of the ways in which they could combine study at Acadia, and creating a focus on women in science was a good idea and could mean that more students would take Women's and Gender Studies courses. Around disciplinary enrolment, it was important also to consider inter-disciplinary enrolment; though President Ivany noted the challenge in getting High School students to understand disciplines and inter-disciplines that they had not been exposed to in High School.

M. Rios thanked G. Whitehall for his question and stated that the student

leadership had been talking to the government to identify incentive models and to identify soft skills that Liberal Arts students bring to the work place.

M. Rios asked President Ivany whether a working group had been formed to work on differentiation.

President Ivany stated that no group was working yet on differentiation. President Ivany referred Senators to the McNeil Report and suggested that they use it as a reference point.

President Ivany felt it important to make the connections with employers but felt that debate around the value of a Liberal Arts degree needed to be carried out on higher ground.

P. Williams announced that it was not noted at the last Senate meeting that a new program – Actuarial Science – had been approved by Senate last month. This program still needed to go to the MPHEC for final approval, but would be housed in the Department of Math and Statistics, and should result in an increase in students.

M. Snyder noted that this would be the only Actuarial Science program east of Montreal.

P. Williams responded that the Department of Math and Statistics had been encouraged to offer this program by local Actuaries.

4) Time-sensitive Items

- a) Curriculum Committee revised curriculum changes to the Business program (*attached*)

Motion to approve revised curriculum changes to the Business Program. Moved by I. Hutchinson, seconded by D. Benoit.

D. Serafini noted that the Curriculum committee had worked with the Business Program to make program descriptions more clear.

A. Quema added that the Curriculum committee felt that any program that was described in the University Calendar needed to be clearly described so that it was understandable to the students and so that they could work through the program requirements.

MOTION APPROVED.

- b) Curriculum Committee curriculum changes to the Education program (*attached*)

Motion to approve the Curriculum Changes to the Education program. Moved by A. Vibert, seconded by M. Corbett.

D. Serafini explained that a mechanism was needed to enable the School of Education to remove failing students from the program.

A. Vibert explained that the current policy of using GPA for undergraduate programs did not work well for the B.Ed. program, because in Education there were a number of Pass/Fail courses, making the use of GPA not a useful tool in deciding whether a student should remain in the program. A. Vibert noted that this was a situation that only occurred very rarely. This was considered an

important policy to have on the books, both for the welfare of the program itself but also to prevent students from continuing in a program that was unsuitable for them.

MOTION APPROVED.

- c) Motion to defer curriculum changes for the Department of Psychology approved at the last Senate meeting

Motion to defer curriculum changes for the Department of Psychology approved at the last Senate meeting to the 2015-2016 Calendar. Moved by S. Major, seconded by P. Williams.

The Chair noted that a revised motion had been circulated earlier and that the request was now only to defer the changes around adding labs to Intro Psych.

S. Major stated that the department didn't want to put something into the Calendar that could not be delivered until 2015-2016 because the department didn't have the resources until then. It was intended that the curriculum changes could be reactivated next year, should resources become available.

MOTION APPROVED.

- d) Professor Emeriti Nominations from the Awards Committee (*previously circulated*)

President Ivany reported that the four nominations were well known to Senators and noted that they all received unanimous approval and support within the committee. Dr. Barry Moody, Dr. Peter Horvath, Dr. Janice Best and Dr. Ed Reekie were nominated.

M. Rios noted that the committee wanted to encourage departments to have more discussions around Emeriti status to honour faculty who were retiring and had made significant contributions both to the discipline and the Acadia community. M. Rios felt that some departments have a strong tradition in bringing names forward, and other departments don't tend to play a part in the process.

P. Williams requested a response to his request for Instructors to be considered for Emeriti status.

President Ivany responded that the committee will be considering this in the near future now that it had completed this cycle, and will come back to Senate on the matter once a firm recommendation has been determined.

Motion to approve the candidates for Professor Emeriti status as nominated by the Awards Committee. Moved by R. Ivany, seconded by T. Herman.

A secret ballot was conducted.

CANDIDATES FOR PROFESSOR EMERITI APPROVED.

- e) Report from the APC regarding Considerations for Assessing Permanent Faculty Position Requests

The Chair reminded Senators that Dr. Wyle's motion from last month had been referred to the APC and that they had been instructed to consult widely and report back with recommendations regarding the motion.

T. Herman spoke to the report and stated that the APC had carried out a wide consultation via e-mail. Full details of the responses were included in the agenda attachments for Senators. The committee discussed the responses and

addressed various points raised by respondents. One concern was with regard to vulnerability of programs to the process and T. Herman stated that it was important that Senate keep in mind that this process asks the Academic Planning Committee to present a prioritized list to Senate, which Senate may then re-order before passing it on to the VP Academic. Although the VP Academic may choose again to re-order the list the VP Academic would be required to provide rationale and justification for any changes.

T. Herman stated that the APC was trying to establish the core principles of the hiring process. T. Herman noted that the APC remained steadfast in its reluctance to prioritize these principles and noted that the majority of the responses were of the same view. Most respondents favoured the APC motion (option B) over the first motion. The School of Business felt that the APC should stand down until they were able to get a better view of the direction in which the institution was going.

T. Herman stated that the APC was aware of its charge from Senate and based on the feedback that they had received, they were offering Option B as the best way to move forward, noting that there had been some amended wording to that motion since the last Senate meeting.

Other members of the APC had nothing to add.

The Chair suggested a 'motion to substitute' in this instance and explained the mechanics of this, whereby the APC would substitute in their motion with revised wording and that this would replace the Motion from H. Wyle.

G. Whitehall asked whether Motion A would be discussed again.

The Chair confirmed that both motions would be considered side by side and discussed. Senators would decide which motion they wished to approve. The Chair noted that amendments had been made to Motion B by the APC, but it would also be in order to make further amendments to either motion.

P. Williams asked whether the motion would be to substitute the revised motion B for Motion A.

The Chair agreed that there would be a discussion of whether Senate was to substitute in the revised APC Motion B for Motion A. If the motion to substitute passed, the revised APC Motion B would become the motion to be voted on; if the motion to substitute failed, Motion A would be the one voted on.

A. Quema felt that there were three motions: the original two motions and a revised motion.

The Chair noted that when a motion was referred to a committee, they could recommend supporting the original motion, supporting the original motion as revised, or they could recommend a new motion to replace the existing motion. In this case, the APC was recommending their revised Motion B replace Motion A.

Motion to substitute the revised motion from the APC for the H. Wyle motion regarding Governing Principles. Moved by T. Herman,

seconded by P. Williams.

T. Herman had no further comments.

P. Williams felt that based in the input from the consultation and feedback received, the community was interested in using motion B, so minor revisions had been made to the motion from the APC.

The Chair opened it up to questions and stated that amendments could be made to either motion.

D. Seamone disagreed and stated that Senate would have to debate whether to substitute before accepting amendments to either motion.

The Chair stated that, according to Robert's Rules, as part of the process to substitute, Senate could amend both motions. That allows both sides to "polish up" their motions to respond to any concerns raised on the floor, before Senate ultimately chose one or the other.

A. Quema asked about the second version of motion B, the amended motion, and asked the APC to clarify the difference between the wording in the two versions of the motion. Original wording of "Ensure that there is a diverse and balanced set of viable academic programs" had now been changed to read "Ensure that there is a viable and diverse set of academic programs as approved by Senate".

P. Williams stated that viable would now operate on the words 'set of academic programs instead of academic programs. The intent was that viability would be assessed across the institution, instead of on an individual unit basis.

G. Whitehall spoke in defense of motion A first.

G. Whitehall talked about the nature of the consultation and stated that he didn't feel that this had been done in the best possible way, and that instead there could have been a robust conversation and an extra University Faculty meeting. G. Whitehall felt that comments made by respondents had been based on misconceptions. It was difficult to move forward on the basis of comments by those that wrote in, because many faculty members were concerned but did not respond.

G. Whitehall felt that motion A had a great strength because it highlighted that no changes to the set of existing programs could happen without explicit Senate approval. Programs could change, but such changes would have to be openly debated and discussed at Senate, not simply evolve over a time as a function of which positions were filled.

G. Whitehall did not feel that principle #1 tied Acadia to the past and believed that the final decisions about educational policy had to be made in Senate. These decisions should not be made in a sub-committee of Senate.

G. Whitehall suggested changing the word 'viability' to something like "integrity of the programs" to get away from the idea of tying to the past. G. Whitehall stated that when a department head needed to decide what to request and how to advocate for a program, it was important for them to know what priorities Senate was considering, so that they could respond to

them.

The Chair noted that any desired language change could be done through an amendment.

A. Quema asked how one could define 'integrity'.

G. Whitehall felt that many of the comments were good and recognized that there was a lot of emotional reactions to the word 'viability'. This word was intended to reflect both basic existence of a program, as well as 'how is it possible to deliver what you have promised'. He gave an example of the only faculty member in a particular sub-field leaving a program, which may leave the program as a whole "viable", yet make delivery of certain aspects of the program difficult. G. Whitehall felt that integrity was a broader, more inclusive term.

S. Henderson commented that the expectation had been that the APC would take the two motions, consult widely and come up with something workable. He felt that instead, this exercise had become a poll. S. Henderson felt that the preparatory work that had been done on motion A had been careful and thoroughly carried out. Complexity had been removed as a result of the type of consultation.

P. Doerr asked whether a vote could be taken on Motion A at this point.

The Chair noted that the question could be called on whether Senate wanted to select motion A or motion B, because this was what was being discussed at present.

G. Whitehall stated that he would want to make an amendment to Motion A before a vote to choose between the two motions was to be taken.

H. Wylie stated that Motion A represented the outcome of an extensive discussion with his colleagues and Senators. There was discussion in this process about the importance of making viability a central concern. It was felt that if principle #1 was not put at the top of the list it would be shunted aside, as it was in Motion B.

M. Rios noted that these sorts of issues continue to arise at Senate. After two years serving on Senate M. Rios felt that more business could be conducted within other Senate committees, including open discussion and amendments prior to coming to the floor of Senate.

M. Rios asked the Chair whether Senate was choosing what to move forward on, and questioned whether once that had been decided, could Senate then proceed to make final amendments.

The Chair responded that once a decision had been made on the motion to substitute Motion B for Motion A, it would only be possible for Senate to make motions to add to Motion B at that point, in ways that did not change the meaning of what had been approved. This procedure was a safety mechanism that protected members from approving substitution of a motion that was later changed into something they did not agree with.

P. Williams stated that Senate ought to be able to suspend Robert's Rules and do whatever Senators preferred to do.

The Chair believed that Robert's Rules were still the best way to proceed, and provided the structure to enable Senate to work on the wording of each motion, then ultimately choose the one preferred by the majority..

G. Whitehall proposed an amendment to Motion A.

Motion to amend 'viability of academic programs' to 'integrity of academic programs' in Motion A. Moved by G. Whitehall, seconded by H. Wyle.

H. Wyle asked whether this change could be treated as a friendly amendment.

The Chair asked if there was any objection to the change noted. There was; therefore it proceeded as a formal amendment.

G. Whitehall spoke to the motion and felt that the term integrity got away from the emotionally charged language and allowed for more flexibility both in the past and the future.

G. Phillips asked a question with regards to the rationale in the motion and asked whether it would now be inconsistent with the wording of Motion A.

G. Whitehall stated that the rationale in Motion A was not part of the motion and that the minutes could reflect that a broader interpretation would be taken.

S. Major echoed P. Williams' frustration with the process. As far as the issue of Senate versus subcommittees making major decisions went, S. Major felt that the APC was required to report back to Senate and had not been given power to make decisions alone.

S. Hennessy stated that the APC could kill a program by not agreeing to rank its tenure track replacement requests highly.

D. Benoit felt that the decision to substitute 'integrity' for 'viability' opened a can of worms, because integrity in a program could potentially require a full roster of faculty to teach in all program areas. D. Benoit noted that a program could therefore be considered not to have integrity unless it had a faculty member to teach in every possible sub-area, which would be an impossible bar to reach at a small institution.

A. Quema felt that some people would be worried that small programs would be considered not to have integrity and would therefore be cut. A. Quema did not feel that this amendment addressed the underlying problem.

AMENDMENT TO WORDING IN MOTION 'A' FAILED.

G. Whitehall circulated his proposed amendments to Motion 'B'.

C. Rushton felt that time was being wasted on formalities and noted that there was an inability for Senators to speak openly and consultatively. C. Rushton suggested a meeting between the movers of Motion 'A' and Motion 'B', to come to a mutually agreeable wording.

The Chair responded that approach had been suggested before the last Senate

meeting, and had been declined.

A. Mitchell preferred to have a vote on the 'motion to substitute' at this point.

D. Seamone believed that the motion to substitute should be discussed without amendments being made.

D. Seamone did not feel that open consultation had occurred, and that instead a survey had been conducted, which kept faculty in their silos.

The Chair responded that she believed that amendments to both motions were in order. However, if Senate wished to vote on the 'motion to substitute', that could occur at this point.

Question to close the debate called by A. Mitchell and seconded by R. Murphy.

The Chair reminded Senators that no further changes to Motion B would be in order, except for additions, should the motion to substitute pass.

P. Doerr asked whether a secret ballot could be requested for the vote to substitute.

The Chair agreed that this would be possible, after the next vote to call the question was taken.

Brian Latta felt that there had not been sufficiently broad consultation, and asked whether a 'motion to table' could be requested at this time.

Motion to table the motion to substitute revised Motion B from the APC for Motion A. Moved by B. Latta, seconded by B. Anderson.

G. Whitehall felt that many people wanted this issue to be discussed in a different manner, either in a forum sponsored by the APC or in a special faculty meeting with student Senators invited.

D. Seamone stated that moving to 'Committee of a whole' could achieve the same thing at a Senate meeting.

A. Quema was concerned about the time issue. A. Quema suggested taking another 20 minutes to discuss the item thoroughly as a committee as a whole, but also have a full discussion outside of Senate. A. Quema felt it ironic that the discussion should be frank and open, but that a secret ballot had been suggested. A special meeting of Senate could be held in April or May to discuss the issue broadly.

The Chair asked whether B. Latta was prepared to withdraw his motion to table, as that was the motion currently under consideration, in favour of a discussion of alternate ways of achieving broader consultation. B. Latta agreed. There were no objections to withdrawing the motion to table.

MOTION TO TABLE WAS WITHDRAWN.

B. Latta had expected Town Hall meetings before now so that people had a chance to talk about all aspects of this matter in depth.

A. Quema asked whether committee of a whole could be combined with a decision to continue the meeting late, and then postpone final decision on the motion to the next meeting.

The Chair confirmed that this would be in order.

D. Seamone asked that committee of a whole would be used at the start of the next Senate meeting.

D. Shea asked whether it was possible to move in Senate a request for a special meeting, wherein the sole topic would be discussion of this item.

The Chair noted that a request in writing by five or more Senators would serve as a call for a special meeting.

J. Wood pointed out that several Senators had expressed concern that the discussion of the topic had not been sufficiently deep to date and wanted the discussion to go beyond Senate.

P. Williams agreed that the APC had been disappointed with the responses that it received and had considered holding a Town Hall meeting, but found that the timelines were a problem, because of the Senate agenda requirement for 'notice of motion'. P. Williams felt that it would be challenging to get Town Hall meetings done prior to the April meeting of Senate.

The Chair stated that a special meeting of Senate could include guests, thus becoming a type of Town Hall meeting, and noted that she had now received a request in writing from five Senators for a special meeting of Senate on Monday March 24th, 2014.

The Chair did a straw vote to see whether this should be an open meeting, welcoming any guests who wished to attend.

The sentiment was affirmative.

P. Williams asked whether there would be another town hall meeting, or if this would be the only meeting to discuss the issue more thoroughly. He also asked how a revised motion would then come to Senate.

C. Stanley felt that one camp appeared to be making a gesture to modify a motion by the other camp and felt that after an open meeting, the APC should have plenty of direction to identify commonalities, and then come forward with another motion.

The Chair returned to the mechanics of the motion to substitute and noted that she was open to alternative suggestions as to how to ensure broad consultation, and also end up with one manageable motion in the end.

A. Mitchell asked whether both movers could withdraw their motions and someone come up with one motion, to avoid the complexities of having two motions under consideration at the same time.

A. Quema asked how these two motions could be discussed at the proposed Special Meeting. Something concrete needed to be provided for people who were not Senators, to avoid wasting more time.

S. Henderson did not feel that people were too entrenched, and that it would be possible to come to a single motion that would capture the main aspects of both Motion A and Motion B.

C. Stanley suggested that Senate had a thesis, an antithesis, and needed a synthesis. He felt it was necessary to go back and look at the founding principles.

H. Wyle stated that he would be willing to withdraw Motion A and let the APC motion stand for a period of one year. H. Wyle felt that attempting to shoehorn agreement into a short period would not allow for a thorough debate.

The Chair asked Senators if they would stay a further 10 minutes to allow a decision to be reached on how to proceed, i.e., to withdraw H. Wyle's motion or to proceed with the Special Meeting.

Agreed.

The Chair summarised that the proposed solution was that H. Wyle would withdraw his motion, the revised set of principles from the APC (i.e., Motion B) would be approved at the next Senate meeting, to be used for this coming year only, and Senate would then proceed with wide consultation across the campus to come up with a set of ongoing principles for future years.

A. Quema asked if Motion B would be amendable at the next Senate meeting.

The Chair confirmed that it would be. An amendment could be made to make it clear that the principles would only apply for one year. Other amendments could also be proposed. Of course, Senators were also free to call the question on the main motion if they did not wish to consider further amendments.

G. Whitehall summarized the procedure and noted that the original motion would be withdrawn, the revised APC motion would be in effect for one year only and the APC would have a campus wide discussion to decide what principles should be used to replace the TTTCAC.

The Chair agreed that H. Wyle would withdraw his motion, discussion would then move on to the APC motion (which could, if Senate desired to do so, be amended to apply for only one year), and a mechanism would be decided on for a structure to have an open and consultative process on campus to establish principles for future years.

B. Anderson stated the importance of having a collaborative, inclusive mechanism to create a broad set of principles for the future.

The Chair suggested the movers of the motions could perhaps get together prior to the next Senate meeting to decide how best to consult widely. There was no clear agreement to do so.

A. Quema was concerned that a decision might now be taken when some Senators had already left and asked whether there was still quorum. There was.

The Chair asked if there were any objections to H. Wyle withdrawing his

motion.

There was one objection.

Motion to allow H. Wyle to withdraw his motion. Moved by H. Wyle, seconded by D. Benoit.

J. Guiney Yallop voiced concerns that some colleagues had left the Senate meeting and thought that the Senate meeting was over, or almost over. A decision was being made that would prevent those Senators from taking part in the debate. J. Guiney Yallop felt it important to take the time to discuss this properly.

S. Henderson still favoured having a special meeting of Senate over withdrawing Motion A, and agreed with J. Guiney Yallop.

A. Quema asked whether H. Wyle could make a notice of motion.

The Chair agreed that he could do a Notice of Motion to withdraw the motion either at a special meeting of Senate or at the next meeting of Senate.

D. Benoit pointed out that he needed to schedule Senate meetings months in advance and would not be available to attend a special meeting of Senate in two weeks' time. D. Benoit felt that despite concerns that some Senators had to leave this meeting, others would not be able to attend a special meeting in two weeks' time. It was important to decide on a process regarding how to proceed. D. Benoit also stated that it was H. Wyle's motion, and he should be free to withdraw it if he wished to do so.

The Chair noted that Senate as a whole now owned the motion, and had to make the decision of whether or not to withdraw the motion.

MOTION TO WITHDRAW H. WYLE MOTION APPROVED.

The Chair asked whether the special meeting of Senate would still proceed, or no.

A. Quema pointed out that a process had now been put in place and that a special meeting was no longer necessary.

T. Herman asked what the special meeting would cover.

The Chair stated that the motion on page 27 from the APC was now the only remaining motion on the table.

G. Whitehall felt that at the next Senate meeting this motion would be voted on and amended as necessary. A broad consultation process would need to take place before next year around what the priorities for Acadia were.

The Senators who had requested the Special Meeting indicated it would no longer be required.

Motion to postpone further discussion of the motion from the APC to the beginning of the next Senate meeting. Moved by C. Stanley, seconded by B. Latta.

D. Shea asked about the timelines for submission to the APC, and how they would be affected.

The Chair felt that this would not be a problem; the timelines could be extended at the next Senate meeting.

MOTION TO POSTPONE APPROVED.

Motion to adjourn at 6:10 p.m.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Form 4 – Proposed Modification to a Program
Bachelor of Business Administration with Honours

1. Required business courses (45h): see #1 of the requirements for Bachelor of Business Administration
2. Further required business courses (12h): 3483, 3993, 4996.
3. 3h of business electives. For students in the second-year Core program, Busi 2993 is required and business electives are reduced to 12h.
4. Required non-business courses (15h): see #2 of the requirements for Bachelor of Business Administration.
5. 30h non-business electives
6. 15h university electives (business or non-business)
7. Students must achieve a B- or better in 57h of requirements 1 and 2, and a C or better in all requirements other than #4. Note that these grade requirements exceed the BBA requirements.
8. A minimum of 120h must be completed with a program GPA of 3.0 or better.

The objectives of the honours program in Business Administration are to develop outstanding and independent achievement, to enrich the educational program in breadth and depth beyond the normal program, and to encourage a student to work to maximum potential so as to increase his/her opportunities for graduate work and for challenging positions in business, industry, and civil service. Application for admission to the honours program should be made to the director, usually at the end of the second year of study.

Bachelor of Business Administration with Honours and Major in Accounting

1. Required business courses (45h): see #1 of the requirements for Bachelor of Business Administration.
2. Further required business courses (12h): 3483, 3993, 4996.
3. Additional required business courses from the accounting discipline (9h): Busi 2033, 3073 and 3083.
4. 15h business electives chosen from the following courses in the accounting and related disciplines: Busi 3113, 3223, 3623, 4013, 4073, 4083, and 4113 (or equivalents approved by the Business school).
5. Busi 2993 if in Core.
6. Required non-business courses (15h): see #2 of the requirements for Bachelor of Business Administration.
7. 30h non-business electives.
8. Students must achieve a B- or better in 57h of requirements 1 and 2, and a C or better in all requirements other than #6. Note that these grade requirements exceed the BBA requirements.
9. A minimum of 120h must be completed with a program GPA of 3.0 or better.

The objectives of the honours program in Business Administration are to develop outstanding and independent achievement, to enrich the educational program in breadth and depth beyond the normal program, and to encourage a student to work to maximum potential so as to increase his/her opportunities for graduate work and for challenging positions in business, industry, and civil service. Application for admission to the honours program should be made to the director, usually at the end of the second year of study. Note: to obtain the major, 9h (6h if not in Core) of business electives must be relegated to the inapplicable category. In other words, honour students seeking the accounting major must take more credit hours (129 in Core or 126 if not in Core) than they need to satisfy the BBAH (120).

Bachelor of Business Administration with Honours and Major in Marketing

1. Required business courses (45h): see #1 of the requirements for Bachelor of Business Administration.
2. Further required business courses (12h): 3483, 3993, 4996.
3. Additional required business course from the marketing discipline (3h): Busi 3433.

4. 15h business electives chosen from the following courses in the marketing discipline: Busi 3463, 4403, 4413, 4423, 4433, 4473, 4483, 4543, and 4653 (or equivalents approved by the Business school).
5. Busi 2993 if in Core.
6. Required non-business courses (15h): see #2 of the requirements for Bachelor of Business Administration.
7. 30h non-business electives.
8. Students must achieve a B- or better in 57h of requirements 1 and 2, and a C or better in all requirements other than #6. Note that these grade requirements exceed the BBA requirements.
9. A minimum of 120h must be completed with a program GPA of 3.0 or better.

The objectives of the honours program in Business Administration are to develop outstanding and independent achievement, to enrich the educational program in breadth and depth beyond the normal program, and to encourage a student to work to maximum potential so as to increase his/her opportunities for graduate work and for challenging positions in business, industry, and civil service. Application for admission to the honours program should be made to the director, usually at the end of the second year of study. Note: honour students seeking the marketing major must take more credit hours (123) if in Core than they need to satisfy the BBAH (120).

BECOMES

Bachelor of Business Administration with Honours

1. Required Business courses (45h): 1013, 1703, 2803, 2013, 2223, 2233, 2423, 2433, 2513, 2733, 2743, 3063, 3613, 4953, 4963, each completed with a grade of B- or better.
2. Required non-business courses (15h): Econ 1013, 1023, Math 1613 or Math 1013, Comm 1213, Econ 2613, each completed with a C- grade or better.
3. Further required business courses (12h): 3483, 3993, 4886 or 4996, each completed with a grade of B- or better.
4. 3h of business electives.
5. 30h non-business electives
6. 15h university electives (business or non-business)
7. A minimum of 120h must be completed with a program GPA of 3.0 or better. Note this and other grade requirements exceed the requirements for both the BBA and BBA with Major degrees.

Bachelor of Business Administration with Honours and Major

Students must complete a minimum of 120 credit hours, though most honours programs with major require the completion of more than 120h. All students must complete 72h as outlined in requirements 1-4 below, plus the additional courses as listed below for their chosen major.

1. All of the following (51h): BUSI 1013, BUSI 1703, BUSI 2803, BUSI 2013, BUSI 2223, BUSI 2233, BUSI 2423, BUSI 2433, BUSI 2513, BUSI 2733, BUSI 2743, BUSI 3063, BUSI 3483, BUSI 3613, BUSI 3993, BUSI 4953, BUSI 4963

2. 6h from: BUSI 4886 or BUSI 4996
3. All of the following (12h): COMM 1213, ECON 1013, ECON 1023, ECON 2613
4. 3h from: MATH 1613 or MATH 1013

Major in Accounting

5. All of the following (9h): BUSI 2033, BUSI 3073, BUSI 3083.
6. 15h from: BUSI 3113, BUSI 3223, BUSI 3623, BUSI 4013, BUSI 4073, BUSI 4083, BUSI 4113 (or approved equivalents)
7. 30h of non-business courses

Major in Business Technology Management

5. All of the following (21h): BUSI 3723, BUSI 3853, BUSI 4663, COMP 1813, COMP 2863, COMP 3513, COMP 2853
6. 6h from: BUSI 3293, BUSI 3733, BUSI 4553, BUSI 4653
7. 3h from COMP 1113, COMP 1893, COMP 2903, COMP 2923
8. 15h of non-business courses

Major in Employment Relations

5. All of the following (9h): BUSI 3313, BUSI 3323, BUSI 4313
6. 15h from BUSI 3483, BUSI 3623, BUSI 3723, BUSI 3733, BUSI 3753, BUSI 3763, BUSI 4323, BUSI 4633, BUSI 4663, BUSI 4933, BUSI 4943, COMM 1223
7. 15h from ECON 3313, ECON 3323, HIST 2403, PSYC 1013, PSYC 1023, PSYC 2123, SOCI 1006, SOCI 2223, SOCI 3253, SOCI 3543, IDST 2253, WGST 3023.
8. 15h of non-business courses

Major in Entrepreneurship and Innovation

5. All of the following (9h): BUSI 3773, BUSI 4773, BUSI 4553
6. 12h from BUSI 2763, BUSI 3723, BUSI 3853, BUSI 4403, BUSI 4613, BUSI 4653, ECON 3833, IDST 2706
7. 30h of non-business courses

Major in Finance

5. All of the following (12h): BUSI 2033, BUSI 3073 (or ECON 2623), BUSI 3243, BUSI 3273
6. 12h from BUSI 3233, BUSI 3253, BUSI 4223, BUSI 4233, BUSI 4243, BUSI 4253

7. 6h from ECON 2113 (or ECON 3913), ECON 2623, ECON 3133, ECON 3143.
8. 24h of non-business courses

Major in Marketing

5. BUSI 3433
6. 15h from BUSI 3463, BUSI 4403, BUSI 4413, BUSI 4423, BUSI 4433, BUSI 4473, BUSI 4483, BUSI 4543, BUSI 4653
7. 30h of non-business courses

Additional Requirements for all Honours BBA with Major programs:

- All courses from requirements #1&2 above must be completed with a grade of B- or better
- All courses from requirements #3&4 above must be completed with a grade of C- or better
- A minimum program GPA of 3.0 or better is required for graduation (n.b. this and other grade requirements exceed the requirements for both the BBA and BBA with Major degree)

The objectives of the honours program in Business Administration are to develop outstanding and independent achievement, to enrich the educational program in breadth and depth beyond the normal program, and to encourage a student to work to maximum potential so as to increase his/her opportunities for graduate work and for challenging positions in business, industry, and civil service. Application for admission to the honours program should be made to the director, usually at the end of the second year of study.

School of Education

Program modification

Additional text to be located on p. 83 of the current Calendar under “Course completion policy”:

Students who fall into any one of the following categories may be placed on probation and not permitted to proceed/continue/in their teaching practicum following a coursework term. Students who:

1. fail to complete and submit their coursework before the beginning of the ensuing practicum
2. fail a course in the BEd curriculum
3. are found to be unprofessional according to the School of Education Professional Conduct Manual and NSTU Code of Ethics

Failure in any two courses (including field placement courses) in the B.Ed. programme will result in dismissal from the programme.

Motion from Department of Psychology

Background: Psychology was given permission to advertise for a CLT Instructor position that would have allowed us to add lab components to Introductory Psychology (for majors only) and to Health Psychology. However, we have just been informed that position will not be filled after all, due to budgetary constraints. We therefore request permission to defer adding the following curriculum changes to the academic calendar, activating them in the 2015-2016 academic year, instead of in the 2014-2015 year. It is our intent to renew our position request for next year; if successful, these changes can then simply be activated next year instead of this year. Note that we checked with the Chair of the Curriculum Committee and the Registrar, and this course represents their advice on how to proceed.

Motion: That Senate approve the deferral of the following curriculum changes; they will be placed in the 2015-2016 academic calendar [pending position approval], rather than the 2014-2015 calendar.

Form 1 – New Course

Psyc 1113 Introductory Psychology for Psyc Majors: Experimental Area An introductory survey of psychology with emphasis on basic processes, including perception, learning, biological bases of behaviour, cognition, and basic research methods. This course is restricted to Psychology majors, and includes a laboratory component. Non-majors should register for Psyc 1013 instead. (1.5 h lab)

Psyc 1123 Introductory Psychology for Psyc Majors: Applied Area An introductory survey of psychology with emphasis on social psychology, developmental psychology, abnormal behaviour, psychotherapy, personality and assessment. This course is restricted to Psychology majors, and includes a laboratory component. Non-majors should register for Psyc 1023 instead. (1.5 h lab) Prereq: Psyc 1113 or permission of instructor

Form 3 – Proposed Modification to an Existing Course

Change in calendar description, course title and prereq

PSYC 1013 INTRODUCTORY PSYCHOLOGY: EXPERIMENTAL AREA An introductory survey of psychology with emphasis on basic processes, including perception, learning, biological bases of behaviour, cognition, and basic research methods.

BECOMES

PSYC 1013 INTRODUCTORY PSYCHOLOGY FOR NON-MAJORS: EXPERIMENTAL AREA An introductory survey of psychology with emphasis on basic processes, including perception, learning, biological bases of behaviour, cognition, and basic research methods. This course is for non-Psychology majors, and does not include a laboratory component. Psychology majors should register for Psyc 1113 instead.

Change in calendar description, course title and prereq

PSYC 1023 INTRODUCTORY PSYCHOLOGY: APPLIED AREA An introductory survey of psychology with emphasis on social psychology, developmental psychology, abnormal behaviour, psychotherapy, personality and assessment. Prereq: Psyc 1013

BECOMES

PSYC 1023 INTRODUCTORY PSYCHOLOGY FOR NON-MAJORS: APPLIED AREA An introductory survey of psychology with emphasis on social psychology, developmental psychology, abnormal behaviour, psychotherapy, personality and assessment. This course is for non-Psychology majors, and does not include a laboratory component. Psychology majors should register for Psyc 1123 instead. Prereq: Psyc 1013 or Psyc 1113

PSYC 2013 RESEARCH DESIGN AND ANALYSIS 1 Introduction to empirical research methods used by psychologists. Although experimental methods will be emphasized, other research methods will be discussed in detail. The principal purpose is to help develop an understanding of basic concepts used in psychological research. (1.5h lab) Prereq: Psyc 1013/1023 with C- or better; registration as a Psychology major or Bachelor of Music with concentration in Music Therapy (or permission of the instructor). Prereq or coreq: Math 1213 or 2213 or 2233

BECOMES

PSYC 2013 RESEARCH DESIGN AND ANALYSIS 1 Introduction to empirical research methods used by psychologists. Although experimental methods will be emphasized, other research methods will be discussed in detail. The principal purpose is to help develop an understanding of basic concepts used in psychological research. (1.5h lab) Prereq: Psyc 1113/1123 with C- or better and registration as a Psychology major, or permission of the instructor. Prereq or coreq: Math 1213 or 2213 or 2233

PSYC 3193 HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY The application of psychological principles to promoting health behaviour and to understanding, treating, and preventing illness. Topics include behavioural and psychological factors in illness; personality and disease; coping with acute and chronic illness; adherence to treatment; development and maintenance of health skills; health education and primary prevention programs; stress and stress management; management of pain and discomfort; and the role of the treatment setting. Prereq: Psyc 2113 or 2123

BECOMES

PSYC 3193 HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY The application of psychological principles to promoting health behaviour and to understanding, treating, and preventing illness. Topics may include behavioural and psychological factors in illness; personality and disease; coping with acute and chronic illness; adherence to treatment; health education and primary prevention programs; stress management; management of pain and discomfort; and the role of the treatment setting. (1.5 h lab) Prereq: Psyc 2023; 2113 or 2123

Form 4 – Proposed Modification to a Program

In the description of the Psychology core courses, page 52 of the 2013-2014 calendar for Arts and page 69 for Science, change Psyc 1013 and Psyc 1023 to Psyc 1113 and Psyc 1123, i.e.:

Psychology core (27h):

1. Psyc1113, 1123, 2013, 2023
2. Math 1213, 1223 or Math 2233, 2243 or Math 2213, 2223
3. 3h from Psyc 2113 or 2123
4. 3h from Psyc 2133, 2143 or 2173
5. 3h from Psyc 2103 or 2153

In the listing of laboratory-based courses, same pages, add Psyc 3193, with an A to indicate it can count towards the Applied Option, i.e.:

Laboratory-based courses: Psyc 3193 (A), 3353 (A), 3363 (A), 3053 (N), 3083 (N), Biol 3063 (N)

In the preamble to the listing of Psychology courses, page 193 of the 2013-2014 calendar, make the following changes:

Psyc 1013 is a prerequisite for Psyc 1023 and both Either Psyc 1013/1023 or Psyc 1113/1123 are prerequisites to all 2000-level Psychology courses, with the exception of Psyc 2013/2023, which require Psyc 1113/1123 (or permission of the instructor) as pre-requisites. Psyc 2013 (or Kine 1113) is prerequisite to all 3000/4000 level Psychology courses. 4000-level courses are open only to students who have completed 30 credit hours in Psychology courses.

In the preamble to the listing of Psychology courses, page 193 of the 2013-2014 calendar, make the following changes:

For greater specificity, please note that for the following 2000-level Psychology courses, either Psyc 1013/1023 or Psyc 1113/1123 are acceptable as pre-requisites (note that the specific pre-requisites are not listed with each course description in the print version of the calendar, but are listed in the on-line version of the calendar; the on-line version should be changed):

Psyc 2103

Psyc 2113

Psyc 2123

Psyc 2123

Psyc 2133

Psyc 2143

Psyc 2153

Psyc 2163

Psyc 2173

Psyc 2183

Also please note that although Psyc 1013 and 1023 are not explicitly listed as pre-requisites for any 3000-4000 level Psychology courses in the print version of the calendar, they are listed as pre-requisites for some (not all) 3000-4000 level courses in the on-line version of the calendar. Psyc 1013/1023 should be removed as explicit pre-requisites for all 3000-4000 level Psychology courses in the on-line version of the calendar. The pre-requisites for Psyc 2013/2023 will be changed to be 1113/1123 or permission of the instructor (please see course change forms for those changes). Once students have completed Psyc 2013, it will be assumed they have the appropriate Introductory Psychology background. Psyc 2013 can then serve as the “gatekeeper” course for all upper-year Psychology courses – it will no longer be necessary to check their Introductory Psychology course credentials.

Motion from the Academic Planning Committee

In making permanent faculty position requests, Senate will endeavour to:

- 1) Ensure there is a viable and diverse set of academic programs;
- 2) Foster potential for interdisciplinary synergies;
- 3) Realize greatest impact for program/subject area/capability development;
- 4) Support the integrity of the varying pedagogical practices, within a framework of overall sustainability.

The APC will use the following factors in assessing permanent faculty position requests as part of its mandate to make recommendations to Senate, with supporting rationale, on hiring priorities.

The factors are:

- 1) Alignment with the definition of an Acadia Education and Acadia's Mission and Vision (How does it contribute to the achievement of Acadia's goals and priorities?),
- 2) Program/Subject Area/Capability Requirements (What do we need to do it well?), and
- 3) How does it support institutional sustainability (Can Acadia afford it from an overall perspective?).

It is recognized that we value diversity in our academic programming and that requests will exhibit variability in the degree to which each factor is addressed. Requests will be assessed on all three factors and each must be present to some degree. Requests should explicitly address the first two points in detail.

MOTION:

Whereas: “The mission of Acadia University is to provide a personalized and rigorous liberal education; promote a robust and respectful scholarly community; and inspire a diversity of students to become critical thinkers, lifelong learners, engaged citizens, and responsible global leaders”; and

Whereas Senate has tasked the Academic Planning Committee (APC) with overseeing the process by which applications to advertise tenure-track faculty positions and continuing appointment librarian positions will be ranked by the Vice-President Academic; and

Whereas the APC will require principles to guide its decisions; therefore, be it Resolved that the APC’s decisions be made in accordance with the criteria listed below in priority order:

- 1) Maintaining viability of academic programs, including IDST programs, that have been approved by Senate;
- 2) Supporting a balance and diversity of programs across the university;
- 3) Fostering potential for interdisciplinary synergies;
- 4) Realizing greatest impact for program development;
- 5) Supporting the integrity of the varying pedagogical practices that are required by given disciplines.

Rationale:

Given that the powers of the disbanded Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee (TTTCAC) have been assumed by the APC, this motion, in the spirit of Senate's responsibility to maintain the integrity of the academic sector of the university, is intended to provide the APC with governing principles similar to those that previously informed the decisions of the TTTCAC. Reflecting principles established in the University's Strategic Plan and in its Mission Statement, this motion offers general guidance to the APC's deliberations before Senate votes on its recommendations, as well as to departments, programs, schools and institutes in their requests to APC for new or replacement positions. By promoting transparency and accountability, the motion also seeks to foster a sense of unity and cooperation across the academic sector.

Rationale for each principle and priority:

1. *Maintaining viability of academic programs, including IDST programs, that have been approved by Senate:*
 - Reflecting the responsibility of the APC to past Senate decisions about academic programs, as well as ensuring the preservation of Acadia's historic academic strengths, this principle affirms that Senate should be the place where decisions about the future of academic programs are made.
2. *Supporting a balance and diversity of programs across the university:*
 - In keeping with the idea that a liberal education is reflected in "balanced, rigorous, distinguished, and purposeful academic and co-curricular programmes" across the university, this principle promotes the idea that a diverse and healthy academic ecosystem -- benefitting students, academic researchers, and the community at large -- relies on exposure to different approaches, different skills, and different questions.

3. *Fostering potential for interdisciplinary synergies:*
 - Given the necessity of IDST programming in order to reflect dynamic academic trends and a changing academic landscape, this principle promotes the integration of IDST program needs into the APC process; promotes integrating IDST programming into department, school, program justifications for new hires; and encourages and reflects pan-university conversations across disciplines, faculties and academic silos.

4. *Realizing greatest impact for program development:*
 - Encouraging nuanced and inclusive deliberation about program growth, development, and innovation, this principle recognizes that new justifications need to be part of that deliberation and underlines the importance of identifying where investment will yield the greatest program, departmental, faculty, university and community effect or impact.

5. *Supporting the integrity of the varying pedagogical practices that are required by given disciplines:*
 - Recognizing that individual programs have specific needs in order to deliver promised curriculum, this principle is intended to ensure that quality education and research is maintained at Acadia and to protect against growth strategies that undermine Acadia's commitment to "provide a personalized and rigorous liberal education."