

Minutes of the Senate Meeting of Monday February 27th, 2017.

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 27th February, 2017 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Anna Kieft presiding and 41 present and two guests. The meeting took place in BAC 132.

Approval of Agenda

The chair noted that there was quorum at present. Before the motion to approve the agenda was moved, item 5) d) was changed to read *Report from the Ad-Hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusion (M. Neilson)* instead of *Update from the Ad-Hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusion (J. Hennessy)*.

Motion to approve the agenda as revised. Moved by S. Sproule, seconded by C. Mitchell.

MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes of the Meeting of
9th January, 2017

Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 9th January, 2017 as distributed. Moved by R. Raeside, seconded by A. Smith.

The Chair asked for any errors, omissions or changes to the Minutes.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES CARRIED WITH ONE ABSTENSION.

3) **Announcements**

a) **From the Chair of Senate**

Regrets were received from S. Mesheau, C. Rushton, L. Elshof, L. Coxhead, S. MacLean, M. Lukeman, E. Samson and E. Patterson. J. Leidl would be arriving late.

The Chair noted that two guests were present: P. Lauzon and M. Neilson. Senators had no objection to them joining the meeting.

b) **From the President**

President Ivany reported on two items. The first related to various reviews that were being undertaken by the Liberal Government but in particular the D. Naylor review of basic science. This would affect the granting council policies in the future.

President Ivany noted that the Minister of Finance's Economic Advisory Council had released several pieces of analysis. President Ivany drew attention to the latest report that identified multiple skills gaps and also cited the need for Canada to take advantage of the opportunity presented by the current international context to attract top talent from around the world. This clearly will impact the higher education sector in terms of attracting both faculty and students. President Ivany expected these reports to add to the work of the Naylor panel. He felt these reviews would point the Government in a particular direction re research – particularly granting councils – funding which will have important implications for Acadia.

President Ivany reported that the university had been successful in raising the \$6.27 million required to complete the Elliott/Huggins Science Complex. This would ensure that the scope of the work would remain unchanged and President Ivany stated that Vice President Morrison would provide a further campus update shortly.

c) From the Vice-President Academic

H. Hemming informed Senators that the Administration would be moving ahead with the following three searches. These had been approved by the Board of Governors at the February meeting and the goal was to have these filled by July 1st, 2017:

- Registrar (External/Internal search)
- University Librarian (External/Internal search)
- Dean, Research & Graduate Studies (Internal search)

H. Hemming provided an update on the Maple League annual event 'Up for Debate' which was held at Bishop's University on February 10th/11th, 2017. Although a bus had been booked to transport students to Bishop's the winter storms caused that to be cancelled. Plans were put into place instead for the students to participate in the debates using a classroom with video conferencing. H. Hemming noted that two Business students, L. Nesbitt and M. Ostling were part of the Acadia debating team this year and they were eventual runners up for The James Blaikie Cup after four rounds of debate. H. Hemming stated that on Friday night the Donald Lecture Series at Bishop's had M. Henein as the guest lecturer. Acadia live streamed the event in the KCIC Auditorium here on campus, and a post lecture panel discussion was held with A. Quema as moderator and R. Newman, P. Abela and E. Crandall as panelists. H. Hemming stated that there were also TedX talks at the event and an ESST student, L. Ehler, presented a talk on 'Advocacy in the Digital Age' electronically. J. Sedgwick was at Bishop's and presented a talk on 'Humanitarian Impulse: Past and Present'. H. Hemming also thanked A. Cohen for all of her work on the Maple League Academic committee.

d) From the Acadia Graduate Students Association

Eileen Haskett reported that the annual Acadia Student Research Innovation Conference would take place on Friday/Saturday and that a diverse number of graduate and undergraduate students would be presenting from all over the campus. A number of faculty would be volunteering their time and donating towards prizes. E. Wunker would be the keynote speaker on Friday and a panel discussion would take place on Saturday at midday. E. Haskett invited Senators to attend and stated that the panel would discuss the influence of politics on research and vice versa. She noted that they were still looking for one more judge for the 1:30 p.m. slot.

D. MacKinnon complimented E. Haskett and the members of the AGSA for the work they had carried out to organize the conference. 18 faculty and staff members would be participating in the adjudication of the conference. A. Biro, A. Quema, A. Redden and J. Brittain had agreed to serve on the panel, with A. Kieft as moderator.

e) From the ASU President

S. Sproule discussed external advocacy efforts and stated that she and B. Jarvin had travelled to Ottawa and Halifax in November and January to advocate to government about different ways that they could invest money to help students access and succeed while in post-secondary studies. In January S.

Sproule presented a pre-budget submission to the Liberal Caucus. She requested that the Government re-allocate money that was invested into NS tax credits and instead provide up-front grants for lower income students. This was already taking place in New Brunswick.

S. Sproule pointed out that students with NS loans can currently have their loans forgiven for the four years that they attend university, however MPHEC has identified that most students take 4.8 years to complete their undergraduate degrees, so that they are requesting that the Government extend that forgiveness of loans to a five year period. S. Sproule noted that they had also asked the Government to extend this forgiveness to NSCC students.

S. Sproule asked the Government to expand the Summer Skills Program so that more students could remain in the Province. Charities or non-profits are currently eligible to receive funding to have a student work for them during the summer and they are requesting that more businesses be allowed to apply.

S. Sproule noted that the ASU was one of 21 associations across the country and noted that the Standing Committee was advocating for a six month grace period for students that graduated, to allow that time period to be interest free. Indigenous student funding is available but S. Sproule noted that the Post-Secondary Student Support Programming has a backlog of 10,000 students that are eligible for the program because there is insufficient funding.

S. Sproule stated that the Standing Committee also requested reconciliation funding on campuses whereby student associations could apply for funds and then offer events and programming on campus.

S. Sproule stated that the ASU elections had taken place and new student Senators would be in place along with other members of the ASU Executive.

S. Sproule noted that as a result of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Acadia had created a Decolonization Committee led by J. Hennessy and R. Myers (ASU Equity Officer). A discussion would be held that evening at 5:30 p.m.

J. Hennessy added that this time was booked some time ago, before the Senate meeting had been re-scheduled to the 27th February.

4) Time Sensitive Items

a) **Motion from the Graduate Curriculum Committee – MA SOCI Curriculum Changes**
(attached)

Motion from the Graduate Curriculum Committee – MA SOCI Curriculum Changes. Moved by D. MacKinnon and seconded by B. Brackney.

D. MacKinnon described these changes which were a number of deletions of Sociology courses that are no longer taught due to changes in the Department faculty and changes to the graduate program.

A. Quema was concerned that six of the 11 courses were being deleted and that Sociology would just be offering generic courses.

D. MacKinnon agreed that this was the case.

A. Quema pointed out that in other programs like Psychology and Politics there continued to be individual courses and specializations.

MOTION CARRIED.

5) New Business

- a) **Motion that the mandate/duties of the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (Policy) be altered to read as follows: 'Duties: to interpret and to apply the conditions of admissions and academic standing as outlined in the University Calendar and to make recommendations to Senate with respect to policy as it relates to admissions, failures, *evaluation methods* and academic regulations.'** (A. Mitchell) (*attached*)

Motion that the mandate/duties of the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (Policy) be altered to read as follows: 'Duties: to interpret and to apply the conditions of admissions and academic standing as outlined in the University Calendar and to make recommendations to Senate with respect to policy as it relates to admissions, failures, *evaluation methods* and academic regulations. Moved by A. Mitchell and seconded by A. Quema.

A. Mitchell explained that he had recently dealt with a difficult situation in his School and one in which the students felt that the evaluation method in a particular course was unfairly applied. He felt that the A&AS (Policy) committee could be given responsibility to interpret and make recommendations with respect to policy as it related to evaluation methods. He felt that any policy change could then be brought forward to Senate for a full discussion and voted upon.

A. Mitchell noted that he had not been able to find a clear directive when it came to rules to be applied in this situation and he felt that it would be a benefit to everyone if there was a possibility of going to a particular Senate committee for assistance.

R. Worvill agreed that evaluation of students was an important part of faculty responsibilities, and had an impact on things happening later for the students in terms of scholarships, graduation and job success. However, she did not feel that members of the A&AS (Policy) committee would feel confident in having opinions and making judgements about evaluation methods in other disciplines. These were discipline specific. R. Worvill agreed that this was a problem that should be addressed.

R. Worvill noted that there is a procedure for complaints and academic matters that keep things discipline specific in that they go from the Head/Director through to the Dean of the Faculty.

A. Mitchell noted that this complaint did go to the Dean but that if the faculty member felt that their evaluation method was fair there was no recourse for the students, Director or Dean.

D. Holmberg pointed out the difficulty in supporting a policy that evaluated different disciplines without infringing on peoples academic freedom. D. Holmberg noted that at the start of the term the Head or Director could review course outlines and request changes. Student complaints could be passed on to a faculty member and addressed at Career Development meetings.

J. Hooper stated that in ridiculous situations there were currently no policies or rules in place to address the situation. He was looking for an appeal process.

J. Hennessy felt that the A&AS (Policy) Committee drafts policy about academic regulations but was not a reactive committee that one would go to in the case of a problem.

D. MacKinnon felt that this might spur some conversation in departments about what was reasonable. He pointed out that in the School of Education it had been common for the whole School to meet at the start of term to evaluate everyone's course and see whether what was planned was reasonable.

A. Quema agreed with D. MacKinnon and noted that in the Faculty of Arts they had held a discussion prior to the Study Break to discuss how first year courses were offered. She noted that variations existed between disciplines but also between departments and within a discipline. Variations were essential to individual approaches. A. Quema felt that workshops could be useful.

G. Gibson agreed that students learn in different ways and were better assessed in different ways but sympathised with the students that found themselves in a difficult situation. G. Gibson asked whether an Ad-hoc committee could be struck by faculty members in a department to address issues such as these.

D. Holmberg agreed that the primary concern was to get some sort of appeals process in place. She felt that a general policy could not work but that if there was a specific problem then a specific approach to that problem could work.

H. Hemming pointed out that the A&AS (Policy) committee looked at the general institutional approach to policy. Evaluation methods would be a difficult area for this committee to produce a policy on that could help the student situation.

A. Mitchell felt that evaluation methods was a subset of academic regulations so that the committee already had a very broad mandate. He was looking for a way to set up a proper appeals process for situations such as these. He recognized that people might be concerned that there would be an overarching 'looking over their shoulder' approach but stated that this had not been his intent at all.

MOTION DEFEATED. FOUR ABSTENSIONS.

The Chair pointed out that other motions on this subject could come to Senate as a 'notice of motion' at a future date.

President Ivany asked whether there would be value in Senate asking the Appeals committee to consider broadening their scope in order to consider these type of issues. This would not be in a binding way but would at least respect the nature of the issue that had been brought forward. If the Appeals committee saw no value in this the committee could come back to Senate.

The Chair reminded Senators that the Appeals committee was now an Ad-hoc committee and would need to be called upon to meet in order to discuss this.

P. Callaghan expressed surprise that A. Mitchell had found himself in this situation and wondered whether the By Laws committee could determine where issues relating to this ought to be addressed.

J. Hennessy felt that the mandate of the Appeals committee covered situations such as this.

A. Quema asked what the difference was between making an appeal to the Appeals committee or making an appeal in this particular situation. She asked whether the students went through the appeal process.

A. Mitchell noted that he received nine written complaint letters from students and that they went through the steps that were available to them. The professor felt that the evaluation had been carried out in a fair manner. Eventually a lengthy discussion between the Dean and the faculty member resulted in changes being made.

A. Mitchell mentioned that many situations arose and that students were under severe stress. Mental illness could occur in all areas of the university community and that when students were not treated fairly his only recourse was to attempt to persuade the faculty member to change his/her mind. A. Mitchell noted that there were policies for re-reading of an examination in place but nothing in place for this sort of situation.

G. Poulter also felt that the Appeals committee was the right place to go to having been through the Head and the Dean.

J. Banks pointed out that the Appeals committee dealt with individuals making an appeal whereas this was really more like a class action appeal.

J. Hollett supported any moves to resolve this problem and felt that this had at some point to come back to the department and the department colleagues to adjudicate. This would require a different approach to that of examination re-reads.

J. MacLeod recalled that the appeals format was to find out whether a professor evaluated fairly based on the evaluation that they had earlier laid out on their course description.

A. Quema asked what would happen if an appeal was made about the format that she was using for her method of evaluation. How could it be evaluated without being unfair to the professor in this situation? This went back to the original discussion of who would be authorized to determine which method of evaluation was an appropriate one.

D. Holmberg felt that the By-laws committee could recommend whether or not the Appeals committee could be used. She suggested that Senate refer this issue to the By-laws committee for consideration.

The Chair asked Senators if they were comfortable with the approach of asking the By-laws committee consider this and report back to the April meeting of Senate.

There were no objections to this approach.

b) Report from the Ad-hoc Community Engagement committee (*attached*)

C. Morley reported from the Ad-hoc Community Engagement committee and noted that the committee of five members had met on two occasions and would continue to meet bi-weekly. At their initial meeting they had reviewed the committee mandate and decided on priorities to be discussed during the winter term. C. Morley noted that the committee was currently in data collection mode and that W. Robicheau was searching through archival material.

C. Morley noted that the committee will focus on the following two items:

- Determine the current status and usage of the co-curricular transcript and how Acadia University could better support and enhance its use for its current and future students
- Look into status of current community engagement activities by department/Faculty; explore how to ensure the myriad of important and innovative activities are documented, reported and celebrated.

C. Morley stated that the committee was looking at both the history of these items as well as what was happening in the present.

The Chair asked whether input was being sought.

C. Morley stated that the committee would welcome input.

P. Callaghan stated that two years ago he made a presentation to the Business Advisory Board about the business of community development. P. Callaghan suggested surveying Schools and Departments to determine what they were doing in this area. He noted that it took quite a while for the School of Business to really pin down what they were doing in community development.

C. Morley agreed but did not want to overload departments with surveys.

D. MacKinnon encouraged the committee to meet with L. Huestis in the Office of Industry and Community Engagement.

President Ivany referred to archival material that described the Acadia Institute (from the 1960's and 1970's) that marshalled the resources of the university around important questions of the day in the community. This was strongly tied to the academic and scholarly work of the University rather than other forms of community connection.

c) Report from the Ad-hoc Committee on Relationships with Other Post-Secondary Institutions (*attached*)

P. Lauzon reported from the Ad-hoc committee on Relationships with Other Post-Secondary Institutions and noted that the mandate for the five member committee was as follows:

- Investigate how Acadia is currently engaged with the Maple League, and how the relationships can enhance students' curricular experiences and faculty development and research experiences.
- Investigate existing relationships with community colleges/universities and 2+2-type agreements/bulk transfer programs (i.e. NSCC-Acadia Business programs, Sir Sanford Fleming College-Acadia Earth Science programs, Memorial University-Acadia Nutrition and Dietetics programs, Acadia-Dalhousie Engineering programs, etc). Identify possible additional relationships and develop a clear process for future proposals.
- Investigate other current or potential linkages that may benefit Acadia.
- Engage with key people and groups on campus (Maple League committee members, School of Business, Department of Earth and Environmental Science, School of Nutrition, School of Engineering, etc.)

P. Lauzon noted that the committee was working on the second piece of the mandate currently to develop a process of recommended steps to set up articulation agreements with other institutions. The committee was looking at what needed to be done before this could occur and also intended to create a common holding place where all the information from past and present could be kept. P. Lauzon stated that the committee was making good progress with designing a process which had four stages to it: initial research and design, determining whether an agreement would be beneficial and whether it would be feasible, procedures for setting up transfer credit structures, ongoing maintenance of such an agreement and listing and designing the articulation protocols.

P. Lauzon stated that the committee had met on two occasions to date.

A. Quema asked whether the committee was looking at programs that were already established at Acadia, for example, programs associated with Languages and Literatures, where a number of agreements of all kinds existed.

P. Lauzon stated that the committee was trying to set up a basic process so that if a department wanted to set up a program there would be steps in place. The committee would be interested in looking at existing programs.

H. Hemming stated that the committee was currently only looking at transfer credits and noted that one of the challenges was that there did not appear to be a standard repository at Acadia for all of these agreements.

A. Quema stated that the French and German programs were based on transfer credits from Germany and France to Acadia but that having a common process would be very helpful.

J. Hennessy pointed out that the 2+2 was typically a college program that had been completed before transferring to Acadia so rather different from the Languages and Literatures transfers.

J. Stanley noted that he was aware of other agreements with the NS Community College because there was a post-graduate Masters degree in Applied Geomatics at Lawrencetown. He noted that there were issues around making sure that the resources were in place to manage an agreement such as that one, for both institutions. J. Stanley felt that the upside for Acadia was that these created pathways for students to come to Acadia and were a good recruiting tool for the University.

P. Lauzon suggested making an appeal to all of the different departments in order to gather all of this information. This would be discussed at the committee level and should allow the committee to see the big picture more clearly.

H. Hemming agreed that the committee did want to gather information but that it had currently been focusing on what would be a go-forward plan for developing these agreements because in the past, they had followed different paths. A more centralized process approved by Senate would work towards ensuring a high quality of academic integrity.

d) Report from the Ad-hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusion

M. Neilson provided a report from the Ad-hoc committee on Diversity and Inclusion and noted that one meeting had been held to date. The committee members had selected a chair and reviewed their mandate, and were currently focusing on a key part of the mandate which was to engage with key people and groups on campus (Equity Officer, Wong International Center, Indigenous Student Society at Acadia, Welkaqnik Aboriginal Gathering Space at Acadia, Acadia Pride, WGS, AUFA-W, Enrolment Services, etc.). The committee had drafted a letter of invitation to all of these groups to ask them to participate in a semi-structured consultation, in order to gather their feedback on their current projects and concerns as well as their vision for diversity and inclusion on campus, as it related to their particular communities.

M. Neilson noted that over the next few weeks the committee would be scheduling these consultations. In addition to gathering information on campus the committee planned to carry out a scan of current best practices across the country to further inform any recommendations that they would make as a committee to Senate.

A. Quema asked for a definition of diversity in this instance.

M. Neilson responded that the committee members had not defined diversity at this point.

**e) Report from the Faculty Support Committee
(attached)**

D. Silver reported from the Faculty Support committee noting that there were nine members and that their mission was to contribute to the success and development of Acadia University Faculty.

D. Silver listed the standard duties of the committee and stated that the committee had already met on six occasions during the year. Three sub-committees had been struck to look into certain areas: a survey group, an alternative/hybrid course and credit group, and a learning and teaching ways and means group.

D. Silver stated that Senate had asked the committee to investigate current research and practices related to the role of technology in learning. The survey sub-committee will conduct a survey during March/April and have results available for Senate at the May meeting.

D. Silver stated that the second request was for the committee to investigate possible hybrid models of course delivery that incorporate in-class and on-line learning modalities and also to develop an updated statement of what a credit hour and/or 3-credit course is, based on alternative/hybrid models. The alternative/hybrid course and credit sub-committee will study this and have a report ready for Senate in May.

D. Silver noted that the third request was for the committee to propose various means of support for faculty teaching/pedagogy development activities. He commented that the committee felt that there was a significant need for improved levels of support for teaching and learning at Acadia and that generally there were many good teachers, however, over the next five to ten years Acadia would experience a lot of change as faculty retired. D. Silver felt that with the loss of the Acadia Institute for Teaching and Technology, and the loss of the Learning Commons due to declining financial resources, this was a difficult time for faculty support. The committee was also reviewing support that was offered at other institutions.

f) Update from the T.I.E. committee

J. Banks presented an update from the T.I.E. committee and noted that the committee had been asked to report back to Senate in the January meeting on two issues: review of current scheduling practices, and to look at the feasibility of broader offerings of on-line courses in the Spring and Summer.

J. Banks discussed the fact that the T.I.E. committee had studied the slot system and scheduling of courses and came to the conclusion that the problem did not lie with the slot system itself but rather with the way in which courses are distributed throughout the slot system. J. Banks noted that there was a need to offer the courses in the current slot system and make use of the guidelines that were approved by Senate in 2013. T.I.E. will recommend that department Heads/Directors and faculty Deans work to spread out the course offerings amongst all available teaching slots.

J. Banks stated that there were barriers to broader offerings of on-line courses. He noted that there was overlap between this committee and the Faculty Support committee and he would be bringing those concerns to the two committees for discussion. He noted that the definition in the Calendar of what a credit hour was did not work well for on-line courses. The Acadia model of on-line courses was one of continuous intake which evolved from the correspondence model and allowed six months to complete a course. This had consequences for students with their student loans but J. Banks felt that that might be fixable. Models other than continuous intake could also be considered. J. Banks noted that the School of Education does have a lot of scheduled offerings on-line but that in that model it would be helpful to have virtual classroom software. This was being considered but was very expensive.

G. Poulter asked whether there had been more discussion about the possibility of returning to a two day study break prior to examinations.

J. Banks stated that this had been discussed but that the December 20th cut-off date still remained and that it was therefore not possible unless Senate voted to change the cut-off date.

G. Poulter reminded J. Banks that at the last Senate meeting it had been suggested that if faculty specified early, middle or late exam dates it should then be possible to reduce the length of the exam schedule.

J. Banks agreed but felt that this was just like a restriction and made converging of an exam schedule difficult.

g) Report from the Awards committee – Honorary Degree recommendations

The Chair explained that the six packages relating to the Honorary Degree recommendations had been previously circulated to Senators. At the end of the discussion there would be a secret ballot vote to approve or disapprove each recommendation.

President Ivany was pleased to bring these six names forward to Senate and discussed the process followed by the Awards committee noting that this was one of the most important aspects of the work of the committee.

President Ivany pointed out various highlights of the careers and service roles of each of the six candidates.

President Ivany went on to discuss the issue of gender parity that had been raised at Senate last year. The committee was very conscious of those concerns and found it difficult to come forward this year with four men and two women. President Ivany noted that 83% of the nominations were male and recognized that something different needed to be done to get more women into the nomination pool. He noted that in the three year moving cohort the figures were 69% male.

President Ivany felt that additional work should be contemplated, either by the Awards committee or by creating an Ad-hoc committee.

President Ivany noted that in spite of the lack of balance there was unanimous support from the committee members for these six recommendations.

S. Sproule served on the Awards committee and felt that all six of these recommendations embodied the values of Acadia and would be inspiring to students at Convocation. She agreed that the gender issue had been discussed at length but that it was also not possible to disadvantage anyone based on race, gender or religion.

H. Gardner also had served on the committee for 10 years and he noted the level of discussion amongst committee members around the high quality of the selections. He wanted Senate to know that the gender imbalance was heavy on the minds of the committee members and hoped that Senate would continue to wrestle with how to ensure that the nominating process allowed for increased numbers of women to be nominated.

A. Quema noted that diversity did not just apply to women. A. Quema felt that there were social and political reason why less nominations came forward for women and suggested a notice of motion for the April Senate meeting: to strike a cross-faculty and cross-disciplinary committee whose work would be to gather information and propose recommendations. A. Quema did not feel that it was appropriate for the Awards committee to be searching for additional female candidates but that a separate committee that had representatives from all Faculties could apply itself to this.

A secret ballot vote was conducted.

While ballots were being counted, President Ivany stated that the Awards committee also was responsible for bringing forward Professor Emeriti designations to Senate and that this could serve as a reminder to Senators to send forward names of retirees that were being recommended for Professor Emeritus status from their units. The committee would be meeting shortly to consider the list of names.

President Ivany also stated that the committee currently receives packages supporting nominations that are of varying quality and quantity which creates challenges when assessing individuals. The committee intends therefore to create a template that will be used for submissions to the Awards committee. This will even the disparity that currently exists. President Ivany was open to advice and templates if other Senators had used one in the past.

G. Bissix commented on one of the challenges of researching an individual for consideration for Honorary Degree status. He noted that confidentiality, in that he could not let the person know that they were being considered, created a problem for him when trying to get information.

President Ivany agreed and stated that the committee would initially be surveying other universities to see how many had moved to a template and how they accommodated the confidentiality requirement.

D. Holmberg took the opportunity to thank the Ad-hoc committees for the work that they were undertaking.

Results of the vote: ALL SIX RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HONORARY DEGREE WERE APPROVED BY A MAJORITY.

b) Adjournment

There being no more business, the Chair called for a motion to adjourn at 6:00 p.m. Moved by S. Sproule.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

**Graduate Curriculum Changes (MA in SOCI)
Approved by the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies**

COURSE DELETIONS

SOCI 5203 – Sociology of Work
SOCI 5223 – Sociology of Occupations
SOCI 5333 – Sociology of Political Economy
SOCI 5343 – Sociology of Development
SOCI 5413 – Sociology of Gender and Feminism
SOCI 5423 – Sociology of Aging

Reason for deletions: These courses are no longer offered

Motion from a member of Senate – Dr. Andrew Mitchell

Motion that the duties of the Admission and Academic Standing Committee (Policy) be changed to read:

'Duties: to interpret and to apply the conditions of admissions and academic standing as outlined in the University Calendar and to make recommendations to Senate with respect to policy as it relates to admissions, failures, **evaluation methods** and academic regulations.'



**Report the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Community Engagement
Submitted by Catherine Morley, Chair (cmorley@acadiau.ca)**

MEMBERS

Jeff Hooper, Dean of Science
Wendy Robicheau, Faculty Rep (Arts)
Mary Sweatman, Faculty Rep (Prof. Studies)
Catherine Morley, Faculty Rep (Science)
Oliver Jacob, Student Rep

Mandate:

1. Document and celebrate the ways in which Acadia is currently engaging with the broader community and integrating this engagement into program curricula.
2. Consider how Acadia can strengthen its links to the broader community in future.
3. Determine the status and usage of the co-curricular transcript. After gauging interest, propose mechanisms to enhance its use in future.
4. Engage with key people and groups on campus (Co-op office, ALL program, Department of Community Development, Associated Alumni of Acadia University, Acadia Entrepreneurship Centre, Acadia Athletics, SMILE, Performing Arts Series, etc)

Activities:

1. The Committee has met twice (January 26; Feb 7); meeting biweekly
2. Election of Chair: Catherine Morley, Faculty Rep (Science) serving as Chair for the 2016/2017 Winter Semester.
3. **Reviewed Committee Mandate:** The Committee reviewed each mandate item provided by Senate. Explained further under Item 4 below, the Committee identified the bolded mandate items as priorities for the remainder of the 2016/2017 Winter Semester.
 - i. **Document and celebrate the ways in which Acadia is currently engaging with the broader community and integrating this engagement into program curricula.**
 - Discussion re: Committee's interpretation of this mandate item. It was agreed that 'Acadia' was meant to include both students and faculty, and 'broader community' was meant to encompass the on-campus community as well as the greater Wolfville and area community. The Committee agreed these were two

distinct activities and that we should be documenting and celebrating our community engagements **and** the ways that these engagements are being incorporated into program curricula.

- Agreed that it is likely that some information gathering is already happening at a Unit level and that it would be important to develop a coherent process for information gathering.
- It was identified that there is already documentation of some community engagement activities by faculty included in the Vice President Academic's report to Senate.

ii. Consider how Acadia can strengthen its links to the broader community in future.

- The Committee agreed that it is important that community engagement is not limited to Acadia reaching out to the community but also welcoming community members and groups who reach out to Acadia's campus.
- Initial thoughts about celebrating current engagement related to sharing connections on the Acadia website (e.g., homepage and departmental/program pages).
- Agreed to explore possible documentation approaches to coalesce current community engagement initiatives for the information of the Committee, Senate, and the public-at-large.

iii. Determine the status and usage of the co-curricular transcript. After gauging interest, propose mechanisms to enhance its use in future.

- Preliminary information was gathered re: use and adoption of the co-curricular transcript. Not well used at Acadia. Agreed to explore how this or a similar documentation of co-curricular activities occurs at other post-secondary institutions.
- Discussed connection to Town of Wolfville and efforts to support connections between community groups and Acadia students through service learning opportunities.

iv. Engage with key people and groups on campus

- Agreed this will unfold as we pursue work on the above.

Committee Goals for the Current Year

The Committee decided to focus on the following items specific and measurable goals for the Winter term:

- Determine the current status and usage of the co-curricular transcript and how Acadia University could better support and enhance its use for its current and future students.
- Look into status of current community engagement activities by department/faculty; explore how to ensure the myriad of important and innovative activities are documented, reported and celebrated!

Relationships with Other Post-Secondary Institutions Committee Transition Report to Senate - Plans for 2017

Membership:

Chair: Paul Lauzon, Arts Representative

VP Academic: Heather Hemming

Professional Studies Representative: Chris Shields

Pure & Applied Science Representative: Allison Walker

Student Representative: Oliver Gardiner

MANDATE:

- Investigate how Acadia is currently engaged with the U4 League, and how the relationships can enhance students' curricular experiences and faculty development and research experiences.
 - Investigate existing relationships with community colleges/universities and 2+2-type agreements/bulk transfer programs (i.e. NSCC-Acadia Business programs, Sir Sanford Fleming College-Acadia Earth Science programs, Memorial University-Acadia Nutrition and Dietetics programs, Acadia-Dalhousie Engineering programs, etc). Identify possible additional relationships and develop a clear process for future proposals.
 - Investigate other current or potential linkages that may benefit Acadia.
 - Engage with key people and groups on campus (U4 league committee members, School of Business, Department of Earth and Environmental Science, School of Nutrition, School of Engineering, etc.)
1. Paul Lauzon is the Chair of the Relationships with Other Post-Secondary Institutions Committee.
 2. Meetings have been held on January 13th and 25th, 2017. Additional meetings will be scheduled throughout the year.
 3. Modalities for the upcoming year (all meetings will be held in person, or some will be held via conference call, Skype, etc.)
 4. The Committee reviewed its duties and determined the following initial tasks:
 - a. Develop a model of recommended steps to establishing successful agreements beneficial to Acadia and feasible to implement:
 - i. Nationally
 - ii. Internationally
 - iii. Internationally non-English Language Programs
 - b. Work closely with the working group on Recruitment

Faculty Support Committee Report to Senate

The current Faculty Support Committee (FSC) is composed of the following people:

Membership (9)	Representative	Term	Retirement	Replacement
1 VP Academic (or designate)	Jeff Banks	ex-officio		
1 Assoc. of Atlantic Univ FDC rep	Darcy Benoit	ex-officio		
1 Coord. of Academic Technologies	Duane Currie	ex-officio		
1 Arts	Lance LaRocque	3 yrs.	2019	
1 Prof. St.	Ann Dodge	2 yrs.	2018	
1 P & A Sc.	Danny Silver [Chair]	1 yr.	2017	<i>Repl. L. Price Sabb</i>
1 Theology	Christopher Killaccky	1 yr.	2017	
1 Librarian/Archivist	Mike Beazley [Sec]	1 yr.	2017	
1 Student	Senewa Sena	1 yr.	2017	

The FSCs' Mission Statement: To contribute to the success and development of Acadia University Faculty.

Standard duties of the FSC are:

- 1) to advocate for teaching and learning resources for faculty
- 2) to collect input from all stakeholders to develop and submit policy recommendations to Senate regarding academic technologies
- 3) to collect faculty ideas and develop suggestions to meet faculty development needs
- 4) to promote teaching excellence on campus and aid in the selection processes for the submission of Acadia faculty for internal and external teaching awards
- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee

2016-17 requests from Senate and progress to date:

The FSC has met six times since October, 2016 (Oct 10, Nov 3, Nov 17, Dec 20, Jan 11, Feb 08), with several sub-committee meetings taking place since November, 2016. We have focused on the Senate requests made of the committee in 2016, while taking into consideration the committee's larger mandate. This has resulted in the creation of three working sub-committees: a survey group, an alternative/hybrid course and credit group, and a learning and teaching ways and means group. The following summarizes the progress made on each of the requests by these groups:

- 1) **Investigate current research and practices related to the role of technology in learning.** How are faculty at Acadia using technology at present, and how can the university further support sound pedagogical use of technology in future?
 - During the process of investigating recent surveys on the role of learning technologies at other institutions, the committee concluded that it would be beneficial to broaden our survey and investigative efforts to consider more general resources in support for teaching and learning. Learning technologies is one of several important factors affecting teaching and learning at the post-secondary level.

- A committee of the FSC is now completing a survey with the objective: To determine the resources and services of greatest importance/value to faculty in support of teaching and learning at Acadia University.
- The plan is conduct this survey in early March, 2017, and compile the results for the April Senate meeting.

2) Investigate possible hybrid models of course delivery that incorporate in-class and online learning modalities.

- Following a preliminary study and discussion by the committee into approaches, advantages and disadvantages of online, hybrid, and flipped courses, a sub-committee was formed. This sub-committee will further study and summarize alternative/hybrid course delivery methods.
- A report is planned for the early May timeframe.

3) If necessary, develop an updated statement(s) of what a credit hour and/or a 3-credit course is, based on alternative/hybrid models. (Current statements from calendar: "Credit Hour: The standard unit by which the course work offered by universities is normally measured. One credit hour (1h) is assigned to a class that meets fifty minutes per week in class instruction, exclusive of laboratory, tutorial, and examination requirements, over a period of one term, or for equivalent class hours at intersession." and "A 3-credit course will have a minimum of 36 contact hours.")

- Several committee members initially investigated the major sources of thinking on credit hour assignment given alternative/hybrid course deliver models. The conclusion was that a lot of good work has occurred in Europe because of the European Union's efforts to set post-secondary course standards (see the Bologna Process guidelines).
- It was agreed that the sub-committee working on alternative/hybrid course models also tackle the closely related issue of course credits
- The report planned for early May from this group will contain a summary of best practices in the area of course credit assignment.

4) Propose various means of support for faculty teaching/pedagogy development activities.

- It is quite clear to the committee that there is significant need for improved levels of support for teaching and learning at Acadia
- This need comes as a result of the fading away of the Acadia Institute for Teaching and Technology and the Learning Commons due to declining financial resources
- The committee has reviewed the resources available at other universities and has been particularly influenced by a conference call meeting with a member of the Purdy Crawford Teaching Centre at Mount Alison University
- A ways and means sub-committee has been created to complete a detailed study of the resources needed at Acadia for teaching and learning. This group will review and provide input to the survey being developed, and take into consideration faculty feedback from that survey.

- The report is planned for the late May time frame.