

Minutes of the Senate Meeting of Wednesday May 10th, 2017.

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 beginning at 9:00 a.m. with Chair A. Kiefte presiding and 30 present and 1 guest. The meeting took place in BAC 132.

- 1) **Approval of Agenda** The Chair noted that there was quorum at present.

**Motion to approve the agenda. Moved by G. Bissix, seconded by D. Holmberg.**

MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA CARRIED.

- 2) **Minutes of the Meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> April, 2017** **Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 10<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 as distributed. Moved by A. Smith, seconded by S. Hewitt.**

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

A. Quema asked that on Page 9, paragraph 2, the wording be altered to read as follows: *A. Quema noted the symmetrical effect of both creation and closure of programs and noted that in the case of creation of programs she had no concerns in principle with input from students and stated that the WGST program conducts exit interviews with students to assess the program from their standpoint.*

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS REVISED CARRIED.  
ONE ABSTENTION.

- 3) **Announcements**  
a) **From the Chair of Senate**

Regrets were received from D. Piper, P. Connelly, J. Leidl, D. Silver, J. Colton, M. Lukeman, E. Samson, B. Brackney, S. MacLean, P. Doerr, J. Hollett, N. Clarke and M. Robertson.

The Chair introduced the following guests: D. Benoit.

- b) **From the President**

President Ivany commented on the Naylor report and stated that the four Maple League institutions had made a joint submission to the review and all felt positive about the report's treatment of a diverse research ecosystem. President Ivany noted that he had indicated to Faculty Council the previous day that the report has the potential to dramatically alter the research funding landscape and would likely be a topic of discussion across the country during the next 12 months. He felt that the content of the Naylor report would have an impact on the Acadia planning cycle over the next year. President Ivany pointed out that like Acadia there were other small

universities still wanting to maintain a strong research thrust within their professoriate. Although Acadia would retain a unique voice for any institutionally specific issues, President Ivany felt that at the policy level there was a need for a strong voice from the Maple League.

D. MacKinnon noted there were multiple ways in which he had tried to work with the granting councils around smaller universities and undergraduate research. In December he had chaired a meeting of Deans of Research all across Canada where he requested that they raise the orthodoxy. The response ranged from polite to resistant.

**c) From the Vice-President Academic**

H. Hemming reported on the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Aid to Small Universities (ASU) 2017-2018 in which a new round of funding builds on previous projects. She noted that ASU grants enable small postsecondary institutions to develop and/or strengthen research capacity in a particular area of the Social Science and Humanities. In 2010 Acadia applied for this funding under the theme Socio-ecological Resilience and since then has received six years of funding. Acadia recently received notification from SSHRC that it had been allotted additional funding. H. Hemming reported that Acadia recently conducted an internal competition for the third project.

Previous funding 2010 – 2013 was for A Study of the History of Beaubassin & the Tantramar Marshes: D. Duke, S. Henderson, B. Moody (History & Classics).

Previous funding 2013 – 2016 was for a Study of the Challenges, Opportunities, and Resources in the Lives of Rural Adolescent Girls: L. Aylward and D. Day (Education), and K. Dye (Business) with 6 research assistants. [www.resilientruralgirls.ca](http://www.resilientruralgirls.ca)

Funding was received for 2017-2018 of \$27,305 which was for a study of Pregnancy, Birth, and Parenting Supports as Sites of Rural Resilience: L. Frank and S. Rudrum.

H. Hemming pointed out that this could be the final year of Acadia being able to receive funding from the SSHRC Aid to Small Universities grant because it was being discontinued.

H. Hemming stated that in Kinesiology a fourth-year student R. Schultz Martins (honours student of S. Mekary) won the top research presentation at the Atlantic Provinces of Exercise Science Conference in March.

In the Department of Community Development an International Environmental Education and Communication Conference led by A. Warner was scheduled for May and has already attracted 400 registrations. H. Hemming also reported that four Core Term Community Projects are largely complete.

- J. Colton's group prepared an analysis of Glooscap's 5 Year Action Plan. It was presented to Council and staff at Glooscap Venture and will be presented again to Glooscap's Board of Directors on May 20

- A. Warner's group produced a promotional video for the Nova Scotia Environmental Network
- M. Sweatman's team worked on a Youth Engagement Strategy for Windsor
- G. Bissix's team visited Scotland and worked on community development and park management in the Trossachs National Park, Loch Lomond.

H. Hemming reported that in the School of Business C. Cadeau, a 4th year accounting student, was one of six winners of the Frank H. Sobey Award for Excellence in Business Studies worth \$25,000. G. Grant won a Killam Fellowship through Fulbright Canada. "The Killam Fellowships Program provides an opportunity for exceptional undergraduate students from universities in Canada and the United States to spend a year (or semester) as an exchange student in the other country." Gillian will study at Clemson University in Clemson, South Carolina in the fall.

H. Hemming noted that in the School of Education Dr. G. MacKinnon was presented with the Judi Harris Research into Practice Award at the conference of the Society of Information Technology in Teacher Education held in Austin, Texas. The award recognizes Gregg's work in applying the TPACK (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) theoretical model to Chinese STEM classrooms.

H. Hemming reported that in the Faculty of Arts, the Social and Political Thought Graduate Program hosted its biennial conference this past weekend. The main speaker was D. White, a Professor of Social Theory and Environmental Studies at the Rhode Island School of Design. He teaches urban and environmental sociology, urban political ecology, social and political theory and the sociology of design and architecture.

H. Hemming stated that in the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science the *National Science & Engineering Research Council* results had recently been announced. There was an 82% success rate for the Acadia applications and total amount of \$1,700,000 was awarded to the following faculty members:

- **Trevor Avery** (Department of Biology)
- **Kirk Hillier** (Department of Biology)
- **Mark Mallory** (Department of Biology)
- **Mike Stokesbury** (Department of Biology)
- **Allison Walker** (Department of Biology)
- **Elhadi Shakshuki** (School of Computer Science)
- **Peir Pufahl** (Department of Earth & Environmental Science)
- **Hugh Chipman** (Department of Mathematics & Statistics)
- **Svetlana Barkanova** (Department of Physics)
- **Craig Bennett** (Department of Physics)

D. Benoit stated that the Acadia Robotics Program would be receiving \$75,000 over the next three year period through the NSERC PromoScience program. This award would be announced next week.

d) From the ASU President

G. Hamilton-Burge noted that it was her second week in office. She introduced S. Nixon, the incoming ASU VP Academic & External, and noted that the other student Senators would be joining Senate in September when they returned to the campus.

4) Time sensitive Items

a) Approval of the list of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2017 *(previously circulated)*

**Motion to approve the list of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2017. Moved by R. Raeside and seconded by J. Hennessy.**

The Chair noted that the list of graduates had been circulated the previous afternoon following the University Faculty Council meeting. The Chair asked whether there were any further changes to the list.

H. Gardner stated that approximately five changes had been sent to the Registrar regarding students from the Divinity College.

MOTION APPROVED WITH AMENDMENTS.

**The Enabling motion was now read and moved by H. Hemming, seconded by A. Smith.**

H. Hemming noted that she wished to add the word ‘policy’ to the title of the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee referred to in the motion.

***“Any candidate for an Acadia degree, diploma or certificate who should receive a grade or otherwise qualify or be disqualified between this Senate meeting and the Senate meeting in September 2017, may, if circumstances require, be considered by the Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standing (Policy) Committee, the appropriate Dean, the appropriate Head/Director, and the Registrar, acting as an ad hoc committee of Senate, they having the power to make consequential amendments to the graduation list. Any such amendments to the list shall be reported to Senate at the next Senate meeting”.***

**ENABLING MOTION APPROVED AS REVISED.**

G. Bissix noticed that the name of one student was shown on both the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Arts with Honours.

**Motion to remove the name Naomi Sara Burkhart from the Bachelor of Arts list and be added to the Bachelor of Arts with Honours. Moved by G. Bissix and seconded by A. Smith.**

The Chair asked that this change be communicated to the Registrar.

5) **Business arising from the April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017 meeting of Senate**

a) **Postponed Motion to Senate from the Curriculum Committee (Policy) that Senate approve the attached policies for the creation and closure of programs (R. Raeside)**

**Postponed Motion to Senate from the Curriculum Committee (Policy) that Senate approve the attached policies for the creation and closure of programs.**

R. Worvill provided clarification around comments made at the previous Senate meeting regarding the French program. R. Worvill stated that a review of the French Department was carried out during 1990-91 or 1991-92 and that as a result the French Master's program was suspended. Two students were in the Master's program at that time and they were given permission to complete their programs. One of the students did complete her degree.

R. Worvill noted that at the same time the French Major and the French Honours program were also suspended for a period of one year. These programs were reinstated after a period of one year as a result of efforts by faculty members from the French Department and in particular J. Best.

R. Worvill pointed out that once the French Majors and the Honours program started back up, the French Department produced eight Honours Theses between the years 1990 and 1999, spread through that decade.

MOTION CARRIED. TWO OPPOSED AND THREE ABSTENTIONS.

6) **New Business**

a) **Professor Emeritus Recommendations from the Awards Committee (previously circulated)**

**Motion that B. Brackney and P. Hobson be granted Professor Emeritus status. Moved by R. Ivany and seconded by D. Holmberg.**

President Ivany stated that there were two names that came forward to Senate from the Awards Committee, both of which had been unanimously supported by the committee. CVs had been circulated for P. Hobson and B. Brackney.

President Ivany encouraged Senators to ask their departments to consider Emeritus candidates for the award.

The Chair pointed out that D. Benoit was attending Senate as a guest but had offered to serve as a scrutineer for the ballot counting. There was general agreement to D. Benoit serving in this way.

The secret ballot was now carried out and both candidates were approved by a large majority.

b) **Nominating Committee Report and Senate Lay Person Nominations (previously circulated)**

A. Mitchell explained that a call for nominations for various positions on Senate sub-committees had been circulated from the Senate Nominating Committee. A. Mitchell stated that some incumbents had indicated that they were willing to continue in positions. A. Mitchell had received a nomination for M. Tango to serve as Faculty Elections Officer and a nomination for D. Holmberg to serve on the Senate Executive as the FP&AS representative. As previously noted, A. Kiefte had agreed to serve as Chair of Senate and R. Raeside had agreed to serve as Deputy Chair of Senate for next year.

A. Mitchell noted that there were six nominations for two vacant Senate Lay Person positions.

A. Mitchell stated that the Nominating Committee was still searching for an Arts representative and a Faculty of Professional Studies representative on the Senate Executive. A representative from the Faculty of Professional Studies was also needed for the Senate By-Laws committee and a six month replacement from July 1<sup>st</sup> – December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2017 was required to replace A. Quema on the By-Laws committee.

The Chair asked whether there were any further nominations from the floor.

There were none.

The Chair asked Senators to make nominations for vacant positions and confirmed that A. Mitchell would be sending out further requests for nominations.

The Chair now explained the voting procedure for the Lay Person positions, which was consistent with the rules laid out in the Senate Constitution and By-Laws.

Successive rounds of voting were now conducted.

The following Lay Persons were elected:

- Zabrina Whitman
- Carolyn Landry

J. Hennessy thanked Senators for their decisions in voting for these two nominees, one from the Gloosecap First Nation and one from the Annapolis Valley First Nation and felt that this would go a long way towards solidifying ties between Acadia and those communities. Z. Whitman was also the official delegate on the President's Advisory Committee on Decolonization.

**c) Senate Committee  
Annual Reports**

**i) Senate Executive  
Committee  
Report**

The Chair asked that each report be received by Senators.

The Chair reported that the Senate Executive had met on six occasions since last May's meeting and discussed the attached report. There were no questions.

The report was received.

**ii) Archives  
Committee  
Report**

The Chair noted that the Archives Committee report had been submitted by Bernard Delpeche.

**iii) Graduate Studies  
Committee  
Report**

The report was received.

D. MacKinnon spoke to the report and stated that the committee had voted unanimously in favour of applying a tuition discount to seniors in the graduate program which would be similar to the discount provided in the undergraduate

program. D. MacKinnon had since heard from C. Callbeck that he was not in favour of the change. D. MacKinnon expected to meet with C. Callbeck shortly and will report back to Senate at the June meeting.

D. MacKinnon also noted that a sub-committee report was being prepared and would also be brought to Senate in June if the Senate Graduate Studies Committee had approved the report.

- iv) **Senate Research Committee Report**
- The report was received.
- D. MacKinnon reported that the committee was focusing on what could be achieved in the short term.
- v) **Research Ethics Board Report**
- The report was received.
- The Chair noted that this report had been submitted by Stephen Maitzen. As he was not a Senator and was not present as a guest, the Chair asked D. MacKinnon to speak to the report.
- D. MacKinnon stated that this committee continues to run in a very efficient manner and was includes great input from two community members. He noted that this is a very diligent committee.
- D. Benoit added that he had found this to be an excellent committee and felt that Acadia REB ranked well ahead of REBs at other universities. D. Benoit noted that response time was very fast and very professional.
- G. Bissix echoed these remarks.
- vi) **Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee Report**
- The report was received.
- S. Landry reported that the SPAC had now determined that in the case of a scholarship course load requirement, students would be allowed to drop as low as 24 credit hours before needing to seek the permission of their department. This change will take effect for 2017-18.
- S. Nixon stated that the student that had agreed to represent the Pure and Applied Science on the committee had resigned and the ASU had not yet been able to appoint a student representative for Pure & Applied Science to the committee. She noted that the ASU Constitution required a by-election and she expected that a student representative would be in place by September.
- vii) **Honours Committee Report**
- The report was received.
- The Chair noted that this had been submitted by J. Yang but asked D. MacKinnon to speak to the report. D. MacKinnon stated that the University had an annual Webster Award from the Webster Foundation which was provided for HSRA students. This is provided to the top academic student in each of the three Faculties. D. MacKinnon noted that this year, because the level of the funds had accumulated, the committee was able to give out six awards; two for each Faculty. This allowed for more remaining money for other HSRAs.

A. Quema asked how the awards were spread through the different Faculties for the remaining 18 students.

D. MacKinnon did not have that information to hand but promised to provide it at the next Senate meeting. He was also asked to provide the six names of the top students and promised to do so shortly.

The report was received.

viii) **Timetable,  
Instruction and  
Examinations  
Committee  
Report**

J. Banks reported that the T.I.E. Committee had met frequently during the last year and had looked into the possibility of changing the slot system. Although it was agreed that the slot system was complex it was felt that the problem remained with the way in which the slot system was utilised. Faculty continued to prefer certain slots and to underutilize certain slots. The committee did consider a slot system used at St. F.X. where a student's class time might not be the same every day but it was felt that this would be a drastic change to the culture and not the direction the committee wanted to go. The committee recommended trying to smooth out use of the current slot system.

J. Banks stated that the committee had set up the Calendar dates for 2018-2019 as well as tentative dates for the next three years.

J. Banks commented that the committee had decided on an electronic method for faculty members to submit their examinations to the Registrar's Office prior to the exam to ensure that the Registrar's Office were in possession of a copy. J. Banks stressed the importance of the Registrar's Office having a copy of the exam for the odd occasion when something delayed the faculty member's arrival at the final exam. This allowed the Registrar's Office to get the exam to the students in time.

J. Banks stated that the committee also discussed problems experienced by students working through Accessibility Services and needing extra time to complete an exam. Should that student have two examinations in a row and have been given extra time, there would only be 30 minutes between a morning and an afternoon exam. Although this was a rare occurrence the committee was asking Accessibility Services to work with both faculty members involved, in addition to the Registrar's Office.

J. Banks reported that the committee also updated the "*Regulations Concerning the Invigilation of Examinations*?" which had not been updated since February 1984. These are now current.

J. Banks noted that T.I.E. had also been asked to look at some on-line courses for the spring and summer and decide how they might be better integrated into the campus. The decision reached was that this was not the purview of the T.I.E. Committee and it preferred to refer this matter back to the Senate Executive Committee.



G. Gibson asked whether the long weekends were expected to continue in the Fall term and a complete week during the Winter term.

J. Banks felt that this was a discussion that would need to continue and that these dates were not set in stone.

G. Gibson pointed out the difficulty of having long weekends for Biology students who were required to take labs. Losing a Monday or a Friday had huge repercussions especially when live samples were being used.

J. Banks agreed that this presented problems. Offering a fall break for the students made the scheduling and rotation much more challenging.

R. Worvill reinforced the Registrar's comments about the importance of having a copy of an exam lodged at the Registrar's Office in case an course instructor was unable to be present.

G. Bissix asked whether the T.I.E. Committee had considered flipping Thursday and Friday in the schedule when long-weekend breaks were occurring, since Friday's were typically underutilized.

J. Banks noted that some units do not utilize Fridays and he felt that this topic was within the VP Academic and Deans' purview.

S. Nixon asked what process was being used to evaluate the timing of fall reading week.

J. Banks stated that information had been gathered with a survey two years earlier and that the responses had indicated a 1/3, 1/3 and 1/3 response in favour of each of the three options. The second most popular option was to not have a reading week during the Fall. J. Banks stated that a second survey would now be conducted early in the Fall and students that had been enrolled for the various different reading week offerings would be able to provide data.

D. Holmberg noted that there had already been two conversations at Senate about the scheduling: one about the fall breaks and another about the one versus two study days prior to examinations starting. Often these discussions were held at the time that the Calendar dates were being brought to Senate for approval and D. Holmberg asked that discussion of this topic be put on the Senate agenda well ahead of the Calendar dates so that a fulsome discussion could take place and possible changes go into the Calendar.

The Chair pointed out that it had come up at a previous meeting that a policy was in place from the past that prevented exams from being scheduled past a certain calendar date (December 21<sup>st</sup>). She reminded Senators that if they wanted to introduce a two-day study break prior to fall exams, as had been discussed at previous meetings, Senate could change the policy regarding the last date of exams.

H. Hemming asked whether the dates for the fall term breaks had been finalized.

J. Banks confirmed that these dates for 2017 had been set. He went on to say that currently the Winter term was supposed to end by December 21<sup>st</sup> – a date that was passed in Senate several years ago. There was also a date by which the term needed to start. He noted the difficulty of creating additional dates between the start date and the end date boundaries.

J. Hennessy stated that 1.5 hour classes were preferred in the Faculty of Arts because they allowed for more discussion time. He felt that this was one reason that the Monday/Wednesday/Friday time slots were less utilized and wondered if there could be more mixing and matching of the 1.5 hour and the one hour classes through the week.

J. Banks responded that a larger problem was that faculty were scheduling classes between 9:30 or 10:00 a.m. to noon and noted that the early morning slots were not being used and nor were the end of day timeslots.

C. Rushton spoke as a member of the T.I.E. Committee and discussed the two break weeks. She noted that the committee had spent time looking at these and ensuring that the time lost did not double up, i.e. if a class lost one Monday on the first long weekend, they wouldn't miss a second Monday on the next long weekend, unless both Thanksgiving and Remembrance Day happened to fall on a Monday. The committee had created tentative dates for three years ahead in order to allow for discussion and possible changes prior to the Calendar being published.

J. Banks stated that students did not like the one week break because mid-terms were then compressed either before or after the break. This added to anxiety and mental health issues for the students and these concerns were being taken seriously.

G. Gibson restated the fact that for the Biology courses and labs, missing a Monday or a Friday was equally challenging.

J. Banks responded that by adding the break to a Holiday weekend a Monday or Friday would already have been lost from the schedule.

A. Quema asked that the end of term boundary in December be extended in order to establish the balance that was being sought. In forcing a different approach into the current template it was necessary to extend the term by one or two days.

A. Quema asked about the three hour classes and whether they were proving popular and spread through the slot system successfully. She noted that through the Women and Gender Studies program she has received mixed reviews from students as some enjoy the three hour block but others struggle with the length especially if classes are scheduled late at night. A. Quema noted that as a teacher there were things that could be done in a three hour block that would be quite impossible in a shorter time. She felt that a survey of the three hour timeslots would also prove interesting.

The report was received.

- ix) **Awards Committee Report**
- President Ivany stated that this committee had followed its familiar pattern of recommending Honorary Degree recipients and Professor Emeriti to Senate. President Ivany felt that there was still work to be done in order to ensure sufficient diversity of nominations for Honorary Degrees. President Ivany noted that there were insufficient numbers of nominations from diverse backgrounds. He asked Senators to consider what could be done to improve the process, noting that departments would be asked in the Fall to consider greater diversity. President Ivany felt that the nominations that had been received were stronger than in previous years but still felt that there was more work to be done in this regard.
- The report was received.
- x) **By-Laws Committee Report**
- The report was received.
- xi) **Library Committee Report**
- The report was received.
- xii) **Nominating Committee Report**
- The Chair noted that A. Mitchell had provided a report earlier in the Senate meeting but asked if there was anything additional to add.
- The report was received.
- xiii) **Curriculum Committee (Administrative) Report**
- P. Callaghan was not present. The Chair asked if there were any questions to be directed to J. Banks. There were none.
- The report was received.
- d) **Senate Ad-hoc Committee Reports**
- i) **Ad-hoc Diversity and Inclusion Committee Report**
- The Chair noted that the report had been received from Maggie Neilson and reminded Senate that there had been some discussion at the previous Senate meeting.
- The report was received.
- 7) **Other Business**
- The Chair asked whether there was any other business to be discussed.
- D. MacKinnon provided Senators with the names of the top academic students in each Faculty to receive the Webster Awards. In the Faculty of Arts

Rachael McNally (Politics) and Paul Xu (Philosophy); in the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science Alexandra Brown (Biology) and Cooper Coats (Biology); and in the Faculty of Professional Studies Jessica Lohnes (Kinesiology) and Kailey Evans (Kinesiology).

D. MacKinnon explained that two undergraduate awards were offered: one on the science side was the NSERC Undergraduate Research Award which would go to science students and not necessarily honours students, and the Honours Summer Research Awards which were funded from the VP Academic office and went to Honours students.

J. Banks reported that he had been successful in finding two Senators to join the Senate Nominating Committee. These were R. Seale (Arts) and M. Robertson (Science).

**8) Adjournment**

There being no additional business, the Chair called for a motion to adjourn at 10:45 a.m. Moved by J. Hennessy.

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

---

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

**Enabling Motion:**

Any candidate for an Acadia degree, diploma or certificate who should receive a grade or otherwise qualify or be disqualified between this Senate meeting and the Senate meeting in September 2017, may, if circumstances require, be considered by the Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standing (Policy) Committee, the appropriate Dean, the appropriate Head/Director, and the Registrar, acting as an ad hoc committee of Senate, they having the power to make consequential amendments to the graduation list. Any such amendments to the list shall be reported to Senate at the next Senate meeting.

List of Graduates for the Spring Convocation will be circulated separately.

## **Curriculum Committee (Policy): Motion to Senate, 10 April 2017 postponed to the Senate meeting of May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

The **Curriculum Committee (Policy)** was directed by Senate at its 12 September 2016 meeting to develop a clear and consistent mechanism/process for degree and program changes, including program creation or closure. The committee recognises that both program creation and program closure are relatively rare events, but the steps leading up to each action may arise from a variety of sources. An overview of these situations with examples from our experience gives context to the process and is presented below:

### **1. Program creation**

New programs or degrees can arise through several routes:

- a) Imposed from outside (e.g., directive from government, accrediting body, external working group, suggested by a unit review). Example: Education programs in the 1990s when the Teachers College in Truro and the Education programs in Dalhousie and St. Marys were rationalized, and relocated to Acadia and Mt St Vincent).
- b) Imposed from inside (directive from President, VP-Academic). Examples: Nursing program (ca. 2005), BSc majors in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (ca. 2007)
- c) From a planning committee – a result of intentional planning by a body set up for that purpose. Examples: Environmental and Sustainability Studies (ca. 2004).
- d) From the Dean(s) – the deans have a broad overview of the registration numbers, enrolment pressures, areas of available space and opportunity and are well placed to act relatively quickly to market forces. Examples: Food Science (late 1980s), Environmental Science (1995), Arts interdisciplinary minors.
- e) From the units – this is the basic bottom-up model, commonly developed as a result of unit planning retreats, and probably the one most often employed. Examples: Electronic Commerce, Environmental Informatics streams in the BCS degree; neuroscience option in Psychology; Actuarial Science; Environmental Geoscience.
- f) From students – conceptually a group of students could devise a new program or option and suggest it to a unit, dean, or the APC. Examples: none known.
- g) By metamorphosis – as need becomes apparent, and a common set of courses is taken by many students, it gets noticed that it would be beneficial to identify a particular stream for marketing purposes. Examples: BASc (Applied Science), Arts interdisciplinary minors, Community Development.

All of these routes are viable methods for the conception of a new program. Any new program must be approved not only by Senate but also by the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC). In order to effect the introduction of a program, a detailed analysis is completed, as required by MPHEC, which addresses issues including:

- Program objectives
- Content (develop a program proposal)
- Admission requirements
- Student outcomes and their relevance
- Demand (market assessment)
- Space, library implications
- Human resource implications
- Home (which department will house it, or will it be its own department, or interdisciplinary?)
- Cost (develop a 10-year business plan)
- Need for the program and overlap with other universities

The analysis is compiled as Curriculum Committee Form 5, which uses many of the questions from the parallel MPHEC form, required for submission to the Province. MPHEC approval is required before provincial funding of the program is assured.

### **Program Closure**

The termination of a program can be effected by several routes that mimic the program creation methods:

- a) Imposed from outside (directive from government, external working group, suggested by a unit review). Example: Education programs were closed by a Dept of Education rationalization exercise in the early 1990s at the Teachers College in Truro and Dalhousie and St. Mary's universities.
- b) Imposed from inside (directive from President, VP-Academic, Senate). Examples: possibly the BSA degree (Secretarial Administration), 1980s; French Honours program, ca. 1990
- c) From a planning committee – a result of intentional planning by a body set up for that purpose. Examples: none known
- d) From the Dean(s) – the deans may be called upon to deal with an urgent situation arising from attrition, loss of staffing, funding, etc. Example: Food Science (1990s); Recreation Management (ca. 2012).
- e) From the units – individual units may recognise a program is no longer attracting students, or has become outdated or unnecessary. In many cases these closures result in retrenching with new programs being formed. Examples: Home Economics; Economics MA
- f) From students – less likely to happen, although student complaints might trigger the closure of a program. Examples: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (ca. 2012) where insufficient courses were available for completion of program following departure of key faculty members.
- g) By metamorphosis – where a program gradually changes focus and a new program is developed out of a residue of courses. Examples: Recreation Management → Community Development; Physical Education → Kinesiology

Several routes exist whereby a program may be identified for closure, and it is necessary to formalize the procedures involved. Furthermore, closure of a program may occur to various extents: full termination, probation for a period, or downsizing (e.g., Honours → major → minor → service courses only). Following the recognition of a potential program to be limited or terminated by one of the routes outlined above, a new Curriculum Committee Form 6 should be employed. This form will ensure that all parties are consulted and relevant information gathered before the decision to close the program is enacted. A critical component of the process for any programs with students currently registered will involve the introduction of an external review of the program before the motion to close the program is placed before Senate.

The Curriculum Committee (Policy) presents this analysis with the appended Form 6: Program Closure for approval by Senate.

**Acadia University Senate Curriculum Committee 2016-2017**  
**Form 6: Program Closure**

1. Department or School

2. Program under consideration for closure

3. Presented to Faculty Council?  Yes  No  Future Meeting

4. Date proposal was or will be submitted to Faculty Council?

5. State the reason(s) for closing this program. Please be specific.

6. Outline the current uptake of the program being terminated. Indicate the number of students in the program over at least the past 5 years.

7. Are any students currently registered in or participating in the program?  Yes  No

If yes, go to Question 8. If no, go to Question 10.

8. Summarize the recommendations from the external review of the program.

9. Explain arrangements being made for existing students in the program.



10. Has the proposed program closure been discussed with students?  Yes  No

11. If 'Yes', do students approve of it?  Yes  No

12. If you checked 'No' to questions 10-11 above, please explain.

13. Explain how this program closure will alter, in any substantive way, the way any other programs are currently delivered?

14. Has the proposed program closure been discussed with faculty members and other involved units?  
 Yes  No

15. If 'Yes', do other units approve of it?  Yes  No

16. If you checked 'No' to questions 14-15 above, please explain.

17. Will this program result in the deletion of any courses?  Yes  No

18. If yes, please list all course numbers to be deleted below, and fill out **Form 2 Course Deletion** for each.

19. Will this program closure result in the modification of any existing courses?  Yes  No

20. If yes, please list all new course numbers below, and fill out **Form 3 Proposed Modification to an Existing Course** for each.

21. Please provide any additional information that you feel may be useful to the Curriculum Committee in its deliberation.



**OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT**

---

**TO:** MEMBERS OF SENATE, ACADIA UNIVERSITY  
**FROM:** RAYMOND E. IVANY, PRESIDENT AND VICE-CHANCELLOR  
**SUBJECT:** HONORARY DEGREE NOMINATIONS  
**DATE:** APRIL 26, 2017

---

The Awards Committee for Honorary Degrees and Emeriti Distinction (Awards Committee) met April 24<sup>th</sup> and reviewed the 2016 submissions addressing each submission individually.

Following thoughtful and careful deliberations, it is with confidence the committee is recommending and is hopeful that Senate will agree, that both candidates are worthy of this honour.

Therefore, the Awards Committee recommends the following distinguished candidates for the Professor Emeritus:

- Dr. William H. Brackney
- Dr. Paul A. R. Hobson

The nomination and support documents are attached for each nomination.

April 26, 2017

---

Raymond E. Ivany  
President and Vice-Chancellor

---

Date

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT TO SENATE**  
**May 10, 2017**

The Senate Executive Committee met on the following dates since last May:

- June 27, 2016
- July 11, 2016
- August 22, 2016
- November 23, 2016
- January 24, 2017
- March 28, 2017

The work completed or ongoing by the Senate Executive during this period includes the following items:

- Selected Senate meeting dates for 2016-2017
- Selected Senate Executive meeting dates for 2016-2017
- Developed Senate meeting agendas
- Reviewed outcomes from Senate's Big Picture Discussions from the previous year. Developed and brought a motion forward to Senate pertaining to the creation of Ad Hoc Committees and tasks to be completed by them and other existing committees as ways of moving forward from these discussions. Committees that have been engaged and continue to be engaged are: Timetable, Instruction Hours, and Examination Committee, Faculty Support Committee, Research Committee, Academic Program Review Committee, Curriculum Policy Committee, Ad Hoc Diversity and Inclusion Committee, Ad Hoc Community Engagement Committee, Ad Hoc Relationships with Other Post-Secondary Institutions Committee.
- Initiated next steps for completion of archiving of older Senate agendas and minutes.
- Discussed creation of documents for students and faculty that pulled together relevant academic policies and procedures from Academic Calendar and Senate policies (Ad Hoc Committee formed by ASU VP and Registrar).
- Requested enrollment presentation to Senate.
- Discussed status of Ad Hoc Committees of Senate and followed up.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anna Kiefte  
Chair, Senate and Senate Executive

**SENATE ARCHIVES COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 2016-2017**  
**DATE: April 24<sup>th</sup> 2017**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:**

Committee Chair and Arts representative: Bernard Delpeche  
Arts representative: Paul Doerr  
Arts representative: Michelle Boyd  
Professional Studies representative:  
Science representative and committee scribe: Catherine Morley  
Theology representative: Carol Ann Janzen  
Alumni appointee: Eleanor Palmer  
Presidential appointee:  
Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches appointee: Shirley Soleil-Day  
Student representative:  
Archivist: Pat Townsend (ex-officio)  
Archivist: Wendy Robicheau (ex-officio)  
University Librarian: Ann Smith

**COMMITTEE MANDATE:**

As representatives of their various constituencies, members of the Senate Archives Committee will work collaboratively;

- (1) To advise and guide on long-term and short-term directions that are consistent with the mandate and strategic direction of the Archives;
- (2) To advocate for the Archives within the University, the Convention of the Atlantic Baptist Churches and the local community;
- (3) To make an annual report;
- (4) To address other Archives-related issues that shall arise from time to time.

**ACTIVITIES THIS YEAR:**

The committee met in October 1<sup>st</sup> 2016, December 1<sup>st</sup> 2016, March 27<sup>th</sup> 2017 and April 01<sup>st</sup> 2017 to discuss issues of concern to Acadia's Archives. We received and reviewed activity reports from the Archivist. The Archives continue to be heavily used by university and community researchers alike. Donations and deposits to the Archives continue to build a strong collection. During the Winter term, the Archives course was offered for the second time.

Submitted by:  
Bernard Delpeche

**Senate Committee on Graduate Studies  
Annual Report to Senate  
May, 2017**

Committee members:

Aylward, L. (Education; PhD program)	Mallory, M. (Biology)
Barr, S. (Geology)	McCarney, K. (Student – Arts)
Brackney, W. (Theology)	Narbeshuber, L. (English)
Brickner, R. (Politics)	Potter, S. (Psychology)
Brittain, J. (Sociology; fall)	Robinson, A. (Student – Theology)
Colton, J. (Community Development; winter)	Spooner, I. (Applied Geomatics)
Liinamaa, S. (Sociology; winter)	Tong, A. (Chemistry)
Locke, J. (Student – Pure & Applied Science)	Trudel, A. (Computer Science)
Lu, W. (Mathematics & Statistics)	Warner, A. (Community Development; fall)
MacKinnon, D. (Dean, RGS; Chair)	Wheeldon, L. (Education; fall)
MacKinnon, G. (Education; winter)	Whitehall, G. (Social & Political Thought)

The Senate Committee on Graduate Studies met on September 29<sup>th</sup> and is scheduled to meet again in May to debate a pending report from a subcommittee on distinction in graduate programs at Acadia. As is the practice of the Committee, uncontentious curriculum items are dealt with by electronic communication. This year, curriculum recommendations came from Education, Geology, Mathematics & Statistics, Psychology, and Sociology,

The business that came before the Committee this year included:

- *Committee representation.* Members of the SCGS sit on various awards committees: SSHRC doctoral, NSERC doctoral, Governor General’s Gold Medal, Nova Scotia Health Research Foundations Scotia Scholarships, SSHRC/CIHR masters award, NSERC master’s award, and the Nova Scotia Research & Innovation Scholarships. In an attempt to distribute the work fairly, the Chair proposed that each Coordinator, or a department/school colleague, sit on two of these committees (3 on each of the Gold Medal and NS Provincial Scholarships);
- *Thesis Chairs.* There was lengthy discussion of the challenges associated with finding chairs for thesis defences. One option proposed was that the department or school head/director chair the defence, thereby reducing the examining committee from 5 to 4 people. Coordinators were asked to take this for discussion to their units. Response was mixed, but generally unsupportive. No changes were made, and the issue of finding thesis chairs remains a challenge.

- *Course completion policy.* The Committee discussed the possibility of establishing a standard time for submission of end-of-term marks for graduate students (e.g., 30 days in the School of Education). As there are some issues that are out of a student's control, the Chair requested that RGS be notified if a graduate student's mark could not be submitted within a reasonable period of time.
- *Senior Tuition Rates.* Committee members were unanimous in supporting a recommendation that discounted rate that seniors (65 and older) receive in undergraduate program (20%) be applied to seniors in graduate programs that have a program fee.
- *Admissions.* The Chair advised the Committee that there have been instances where applicants to graduate programs have waited an inordinately long time to receive any communication concerning the status of their applications. Substantial stress was placed on the value of a "personal touch" in ensuring periodic communication with applicants, especially in situations where admission decisions are delayed.

The only subcommittee established this year – initially focused on quality assurance and later refocused on graduate program distinctiveness – met on January 24<sup>th</sup> and March 7<sup>th</sup>, and numerous times online. The subcommittee members were Saara Liinamaa, Jeremy Locke, David MacKinnon, Mark Mallory, and Alan Warner. The draft report is currently (at the time of writing) with the acting VP Academic for discussion with the Chair, to ensure it does not conflict with guidelines from MPHEC. Coordinators have also taken it to their departments and schools for discussion. The intention is to then bring it before the SCGS at a meeting in May.

Submitted by:

David MacKinnon  
Chair, Senate Committee on Graduate Studies

**Senate Research Committee  
Annual Report to Senate  
May 2017**

Committee members:

Brackney, W. (Theology)	Patterson, E. (Library; fall)
Campbell, H. (Graduate student)	Redden, A. (Research centre director)
Colton, J. (Professional Studies; winter)	Robicheau, W. (Library; winter)
Coxhead, L. (Undergraduate student)	Silver, D. (Pure & Applied Science)
Frank, L. (Arts)	Trofanenko, B. (Canada Research Chair)
Mackinnon, D. (Dean, RGS; Chair)	Warner, A (Professional Studies; fall)

The Senate Research Committee met on four occasions in 2016: July 6<sup>th</sup>, October 3<sup>rd</sup>, November 14<sup>th</sup>, and December 5<sup>th</sup>. A subcommittee – Hope Campbell, Lesley Frank, and Danny Silver – met on numerous occasions in the winter of 2017 to plan an undergraduate student research session

The meetings in July and October were focused on the 2015 – 2020 Strategic Research Plan, and specifically on its action plan Appendix. The Committee categorized the action plan into those initiatives that involve minimal resources and could be staged in the short term, and initiatives that require more resources and therefore longer term planning. Following from this, it was agreed that the focus for 2016 – 2017 would be in three areas: (a) support for faculty interested in applying for SSHRC funding, (b) general grant writing support, and (c) celebrating student research.

***SSHRC support***

Research & Graduate Studies, with the support of the Senate Research Committee and the Dean of Arts, established office space in the Arts complex and planned to operate it in a weekly time slot with at least one staff member from RGS, and occasionally with guest SSHRC scholars from sister institutions. The focus was to provide support for those planning to apply in the 2016 Insight and 2017 Insight Development competitions, as well as longer term planning for those considering SSHC applications beyond this year. Unfortunately, there was no uptake on this initiative.

A workshop was held on December 9<sup>th</sup>, facilitated by Dr. Adrian Kelly, the SSHRC grant facilitator at Saint Mary's University. A total of 35 faculty and staff attended.

***General grant support***

In addition to the intended weekly summer support for SSHRC, the Senate Research Committee and RGS offered one-time workshops for faculty and student grant applicants. This included the following:

- 12 July                      General faculty workshop for NSERC applicants



- 13 September NSERC workshop for students – CGS applicants
- 16 September SSHRC workshop for students – CGS (Social & Political Thought)
- 30 September SSHRC general workshop for students – CGS applicants
- 12 October SSHRC workshop for students – CGS (Sociology)

### ***Student research***

Beyond support for student applications for grants and awards, there were two primary student research events. The first, included as an action item in the Strategic Research Plan, was a series of “wild ideas” presentations. The vehicle chosen was a format called PechaKucha, or “the art of precise presentation.” Frequently referred to as 20x20, the format allows the presenter 20 slides, each displayed for 20 seconds. The presenter talks, but is restricted to the time allotted per slide. A subcommittee of Hope Campbell, Lesley Frank, and Danny Silver planned this event for February 15<sup>th</sup>. Unfortunately, there insufficient student participants to offer it. The intention is to try again in 2017-2018.

The second event was the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Student Research & Innovation Conference on March 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>. Organized by the Graduate Students, but including both undergraduate and graduate student researchers, the highly successful conference included poster sessions and formal presentations. Volunteer faculty members served on adjudication committees to award Best Undergraduate Presentation (offered by President Ivany) and Best Graduate Presentation (offered by Dean MacKinnon), as well as numerous other awards and gifts, offered by various on-campus groups and Town of Wolfville merchants. The Conference was supported by the Office of Research & Graduate Studies and the Senate Research Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

David MacKinnon  
Chair, Senate Research Committee

## **RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT, 2016–2017**

For the period 1 May 2016 to 30 April 2017:

**Committee Membership:** Joan Boutilier (Community), Emily Chase\* (AGSA), David Duke (Arts, to 30 June), Anita Hudak (Community), David MacKinnon\* (RGS), Stephen Maitzen (Chair), Claire Mallin (Arts, from 1 July), Susan Potter (Science), Anna Robbins (Theology), Conor Vibert (Professional Studies)

\* non-voting

**Meetings and Review of Applications:** The REB met on 11 occasions and reviewed 83 new formal applications for ethics approval. The Chair also reviewed numerous formal requests from researchers to approve changes to previously approved research.

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

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

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

**Appeals:** None

**Complaints:** None

**Guidance sought from the Canadian Secretariat on Research Ethics:** None

**Matters out of the ordinary:** None.

**Transitional Chair for Summer:** S. Maitzen

**Other comments:** None

Submitted by Stephen Maitzen (Chair)

## ACADIA UNIVERSITY

## Report of the SCHOLARSHIPS, PRIZES AND AWARDS COMMITTEE (SPAC) to SENATE

REPORT DATE: April 18, 2017

SPAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Membership	July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017	July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018
Arts	Stephen Ahern	TBA
	Gillian Poulter	Gillian Poulter
	Colin Mitchell (Student Rep)	Katie Winters (Student Rep)
Professional Studies	Scott Landry (Committee Chair)	Scott Landry (interim chair until Fall meeting)
	Harish Kapoor	Harish Kapoor
	Senewa Sena (Student Rep)	Regan Haley (Student Rep)
Pure & Applied Science	Anthony Tong	TBA
	Richard Karsten	Richard Karsten
	Lucas Coxhead (Student Rep)	Alex Hebert (Student Rep)
Registrar or Delegate	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager, Scholarships and Financial Assistance	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager, Scholarships and Financial Assistance
Financial Aid Counselor	Pamela D'Entremont (Committee Secretary)	Pamela D'Entremont (Committee Secretary)

PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

1. To decide policy and process by which recipients of scholarships, prizes, bursaries, scholar-bursaries, awards, and convocation medals are to be selected and to gather all information it considers necessary for the selection;
2. To select the recipients of undergraduate entrance scholarships, prizes and awards and some in-course scholarships, prizes, and awards;
3. To periodically review the scholarships, prizes and awards program and to recommend improvements (increased funds, new scholarships, more prizes, etc.) to those involved in the program;
4. To promote interest in the scholarship program;
5. To consider such other matters as the Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

MEETINGS DATES

Committee meetings were held during 2016-2017 on the following dates:

October 18, 2016  
November 29, 2016  
January 9, 2017  
February 22, 2017  
March 5, 2017  
April 13, 2017

The Awards & Appeals Sub Committee held several meetings to decide upon various awards and matters. The Bursary & Loan Sub Committee of SPAC met weekly throughout the academic year. Acadia's Student Assistance Program (ASAP) assisted 125 students in the 2016-2017 academic year with a budget of \$250,000.

### AGENDAS, DISCUSSIONS and CONCLUSIONS

The following represents the main agenda topics:

#### 1. Awarding of 2017 Entrance Scholarships

Through the entrance scholarship process, 1197 prospective students were offered entrance scholarships or scholar-bursaries for the 2017-18 academic year as of the date of this report. This included renewable entrance merit based scholarships to all incoming students (in their first undergraduate degree) with a scholarship average of above 80%.

To be competitive with other universities, our top entrance scholarships were valued as follows:

- Three Chancellor's Scholarships each valued at \$10,000 renewable
- Three Board of Governor's Scholarships each valued at \$8,000 renewable
- Three President's Scholarships each valued at \$7,000 renewable
- Six International Baccalaureate Scholarships each valued at \$6,000 renewable

The academic requirements for the 2017-2018 grade based entrance scholarship program criteria did not change from the previous year. The scholarship program uses a combined average – a weighted average using grade 11 and grade 12 to calculate a scholarship average. Students entering with a scholarship average of 90 – 94.9% also receive a \$1000 non-renewable BMO Financial Group Entrance Scholarship for the 2017-2018 academic year.

As part of the entrance scholarship application process the Committee used a standardized group score spreadsheet. Due to the NSTU labour dispute in the public schools, the academic letter of reference was waived for students attending a NS public high school. The Committee reviewed and revised the evaluation grid to account for the waiver. The top 120 files were reviewed. Minor changes have been made to the entrance scholarship forms and evaluation grid for the 2018 entrance scholarship program.

#### 2. Data Analysis – Distribution of Entrance Scholarships Among Faculties

Discussions continued at several meetings. The analysis and research of scholarship proportion by value was requested and presented to the VP Academic by Duane Currie, Coordinator of Academic Technologies. The University recruits for all programs and the entrance scholarship program is determined by senior administration.

#### 3. Scholarship Course Load and Non-Credit Math Courses

Math 0110 or Math 0120 does not count in a student's course load hours as both are non-credit but the student is still doing the equivalent work load of a credit course. It was agreed the non-credit math courses be included in the course load count for scholarship purposes.

#### 4. Scholarship Course Load Requirement

Students holding Acadia scholarships, awards, etc are required to be in a full course load unless they have approval from their Faculty Dean/Director for a reduced course load provided the student is still registered as full time. To streamline this process, the need for approval of their Faculty Dean/Director is now required only for students in less than 24 credit hours provided the student is still full time. This change is effective as of the 2017-2018 academic year.

#### 5. University Bronze Medal Criteria

As approved by the Faculty Deans, the terms of reference and guidelines were updated in 2015 and the qualifying average criteria was updated in 2016. Current programs and majors are included.

6. Review of Committee Mandate

The Committee duties were reviewed. No changes were made.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont  
Secretary

Scott Landry  
Chair

## **Senate Honours Committee Annual Report for 2016-2017**

**April 20, 2017**

### **Committee Members:**

David MacKinnon, Dean of Research and Graduate Studies (ex-officio)  
Jeff Banks, Acting Registrar (ex-officio)  
Anna Redden, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science (Chair during fall term)  
Ying Zhang, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science  
Marc Ramsey, Faculty of Arts  
Cynthia Alexander, Faculty of Arts  
Chris Shields, Faculty of Professional Studies (winter semester)  
Stephen MacLean, Faculty of Professional Studies (fall semester)  
Jun Yang, Faculty of Professional Studies (acting Chair during winter term)  
Sarah Glazier, Student representative (Arts)  
Carolyn Woolridge, Student representative (Professional Studies)  
Soliel Chahine, Student representative (P&A Science)

Throughout the year the Honours Committee monitors and responds to any issue on Honours programs, policies, and practices.

### **Honours Summer Research Awards (HSRA)**

- During the September meeting the committee discussed and agreed that the use of the Program GPA as one measure of assessment of HSRA applications should continue. NSERC USRAs also target high performing students who may not be entering their final year of study, so Cumulative GPA is used in its applications. The call for applications and the application form for HSRA were amended with additional information regarding the use of the program GPA.
- The HSRAs were adjudicated on March 2<sup>nd</sup> and in total \$109,800 was awarded (not including contributions from individual faculty members). The fund came from three sources: \$64,000 from the VPA office, \$35,000 from the Webster Foundation (awarded to the top two students from each Faculty – this was double the number of Webster’s from previous years), and \$10,800 from the FPAS Dean’s office. Initially there were 48 applications, among which 11 were awarded USRAs and subsequently removed from the HSRA list. Among those that remained, 6 were awarded a Webster Foundation award and 18 students were awarded HSRA’s.

### **Honours Theses**

- During the fall semester, the committee approved a change (optional) that the introductory pages of the Honours Thesis (specifically the signature pages) should be single-sided. The Guidelines for the Honours Thesis were revised accordingly.
- There were 101 Honours theses submitted during the 2016-2017 academic year.
- The theses were reviewed by 89 external on-campus reviewers (faculty not involved in the student's research).
- The committee thanks all of our external reviewers for providing critical and constructive feedback within the review period. This process enhances the quality of the theses submitted, the learning experience of Honours students, and overall it strengthens the Honours program at Acadia.

Submitted by

Jun Yang  
Chair of the Senate Honours Committee (acting)

Timetable, Instruction Hours, and Examination (TIE) Committee Report  
Annual Report to Senate (2016 – 2017)  
April 6, 2017

Members

Rick Mehta, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science, Chair  
Christianne Rushton, Faculty of Arts  
Scott Landry, Faculty of Professional Studies  
Jeff Banks, Acting Registrar, ex-officio  
James Sanford, Senior Director Student Affairs, ex-officio  
Lucas Coxhead, Student Representative  
Colin Mitchell, Student Representative

The TIE Committee met once per month over the past academic year and discussed the following six issues, which are summarized below.

- 1) The issue of the slot system (timetable reform) was the item that was discussed most extensively over the past year. The committee discussed the pros and cons of changing the slot system. Unfortunately, changing the slot system would not address the core problem, which is that some slots (especially between 10 am and 2 pm) tend to be popular times to hold classes while other slots (e.g., 8:30 am classes, the last slot on Monday, Friday afternoons) tend to be underused. Rather than reform the timetable, the TIE Committee believes that faculty members in all academic units should cooperate to ensure that courses are made available across the entire range of time slots. Furthermore, the TIE Committee has come up with a recommendation on how this goal can be accomplished (Recommendation in a separate document).
- 2) The committee set up the Calendar dates (e.g., when classes and exams start and end) for the 2018-2019 academic year, and set up the tentative dates for the following three academic years. The tentative dates until 2020 have been posted on the Registrar's web site. Finally, the Committee updated the principles that are used for preparing academic Calendar dates.
- 3) Shawna Singleton set up a method by which final exams can be submitted to the Registrar's Office electronically using the HUB. Members of the TIE Committee tested it to ensure that it works. This committee will consider making this option available to faculty for the Fall 2017 final exam period.
- 4) The TIE Committee discussed the issue of what to do in the event that students who write their final exams with Accessibility Services run into the problem of having multiple exams back to back on the same day. For example, a student could encounter a situation in which they are writing one final



exam from 9 am to 1:30 pm and then have to write another final exam from 2 pm to 6:30 pm. In this situation, the student would be writing for 9 hours that day and would have only a half hour of break time. This is clearly not enough time to mentally recuperate or even have a meal in a civilized fashion between exams. The TIE Committee recommends that Accessibility Services advocate on behalf of the student and request that one of the two faculty members allow the student to write their exam at a different time. If neither faculty member is willing to cooperate, then Accessibility Services should refer the issue to the TIE Committee.

- 5) The TIE Committee reviewed and updated the “Regulations Concerning the Invigilation of Examinations”, which have been in place since February 1984.
- 6) The TIE Committee discussed Senate’s request for the TIE Committee to consider the offerings of online courses and Spring/Summer on-campus Open Acadia courses, and to consider whether these offerings could be better integrated into the overall program offerings at Acadia. The Committee concluded that this request was outside of our purview and that it would be more appropriate for this request to be directed to the Executive.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rick Mehta, Chair, TIE Committee

Recommendation from TIE Committee  
April 6, 2017

The TIE Committee discussed the issue of timetable reform and concluded that reforming the slot system would not address the key problems that students are facing, namely that a large number of courses are not available for students and that this problem is forcing them to explore other options, such as taking courses online or over the summer because these courses are not available during the academic year. This problem is arising in large part because the time slots between 10:30 and 2:30 are overused whereas other time slots (especially the ones between 8:30 and 10:30) are underused. If a large number of classes are being offered in a limited range of time slots, it is only inevitable that conflicts will arise that will prevent students from being able to register for the courses they require for their degree. Reforming or overhauling the timetable system will not alleviate these problems; instead, the TIE Committee's position is that faculty members in all departments follow the policies that are already in place in a) the Collective Agreement between the Board of Governors and AUFA, and in b) Senate's Regulations. Some academic units already go a good job of spreading out their courses in the timeslot system (e.g., holding required or popular courses at 8:30 a.m.); however, others do not.

Given that there are discrepancies in the extent to which academic units follow policies that are already in place, the TIE Committee recommends that all academic units do their part to spread out their courses so that more timeslots are used. To ensure that there is a mechanism in place that will maximize the likelihood that these policies are followed, the TIE Committee strongly recommends that the Deans raise the importance of this issue at Heads and Directors; if needed, the Deans can bring up the point that faculty can have a *say* in when they prefer to teach – but that they are expected to cooperate with the needs of their academic unit and students. Department Heads and Directors of Schools can then remind members of their units about these key issues when it comes time to schedule courses for the upcoming academic year.

When Departments and Schools are working on their schedules, the TIE Committee recommends that they consider the following principles explained below. These principles were adapted from the Minutes of the Senate meeting of Monday, November 18, 2013. In these minutes, “D. Serafini pointed out that any assessment of timetabling needed to fully consider the following: Faculty needs, Student needs, Space needs, [and] Curriculum needs” (p. 4). The TIE Committee discussed these principles and ordered them in the order of priority shown below. The Committee has also provided examples to explain how these principles are defined so that there is no miscommunication among Heads, Directors, Deans, and members of academic units about what these principles entail.

1. Student needs

Courses that are required for a degree or program should be scheduled in timeslots that are accessible for as many students as possible. Furthermore, required courses should not conflict with other required courses.

2. Curriculum needs

Courses should be scheduled in timeslots that will allow Departments and Schools to offer the full range of courses to meet the needs of their respective curricula.

3. Space needs

Courses should be scheduled in timeslots where classrooms will be available. This principle is most relevant for large classes or ones that use rooms where specialized equipment is required for the course.

4. Faculty needs

The TIE Committee realizes that everyone has commitments outside of their university/professional lives and is in favour of making reasonable efforts to ensure that everyone can have a work-life balance. Conversely, the TIE Committee believes that all faculty should make reasonable efforts to address the above principles (student needs, curriculum needs, and space needs).

Respectfully submitted,  
Rick Mehta, Chair, TIE Committee



**Awards Committee for Honorary Degrees and Emeriti Distinction  
(Awards Committee)  
Annual Report for 2016-2017  
May 2, 2017**

**Committee Members 2016-2017:**

Ray Ivany, President and Vice-Chancellor (Chair)  
Dr. Derek Charke, Faculty of Arts Representative  
Dr. Harry Gardner, Acadia Divinity College/Faculty of Theology Representative  
Ashley Parsons, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science Representative  
John Rogers, Board of Governors Representative  
Dr. Roxanne Seaman, Faculty of Professional Studies Representative  
Samantha Sproule, SRC Representative  
Pat Townsend, Librarian/Archivist Representative  
Kathy O'Connor, Recording Secretary

**The Purpose of the Committee is to:**

1. invite nominations for Honorary Doctorate degrees and Professors, Librarian, Archivists and Instructor Emeriti awards;
2. adjudicate the nominations; and
3. recommend nominees thereon to Senate.

**Meetings 2016-2017**


- December 20, 2016
- January 20, 2017
- April 24, 2017

**Summary of Committee Activities:**

A call for nominations was sent to the campus community in October 1, 2016. Following thorough review and discussion, the Committee forwarded to Senate for a vote by secret ballot a total of six Honorary Degrees and two Professor Emeritus nominations. All six Honorary Degrees were approved by Senate. A vote for the Emeritus nominations will be held at the May 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

In an effort to standardize the Honorary Degree nominations submitted to the Awards Committee, the committee is surveying practices at other universities and intends to use the information to create a template. The members will bring this recommendation forward to Senate prior to the 2017-2018 call for nominations.

Respectfully submitted by the Chair,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Ivany', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Raymond E. Ivany  
President and Vice-Chancellor

**By-Laws Committee  
Annual Report  
10<sup>th</sup> May 2017**

Committee members 2016-2017:

Arts: Anne Quéma  
Pure & Applied Science: Glenys Gibson  
Professional Studies: Jim MacLeod (Acting Chair of By-Laws)  
Theology: Vacant

The duties of the By-Laws Committee are:

- a) to incorporate, on an annual basis, any changes to the By-Laws.
- b) to review any changes to the By-Laws of Faculty and Faculty Councils prior to their presentation(s) to Senate and recommend any revisions or additions deemed necessary.
- c) to conduct periodic reviews of the By-Laws of Senate, Faculty, and Faculty councils and recommend any changes or additions deemed necessary. These review should be staggered such that the By-Laws of each of these bodies are reviewed at a minimum every five years.
- d) to monitor the evolution of the academic committees and to recommend changes to the committee structure of Faculty Councils and other bodies at the University for which each committee is responsible.
- e) to deal with any other matter that Senate might refer to the By-Laws Committee.

Two issues that the By-Laws Committee was asked to clarify were:

1. How the the representative of the Association of Atlantic Universities Faculty Development Committee Is appointed to Acadia's Faculty Development Committee. The answer:
  - a. On behalf of each university, its President selects its member to be on AAU FDC.
  - b. There is no term of office/length of appointment for each member to AAU FDC
2. By-Laws was asked to resolve an issue regarding fair methods of evaluations of students' assignments. By-Laws presented a motion to Senate, and said motion (amended) was passed that resulted in a change of wording in Academic Calendar for 2017-2018. (See minutes of April 2017 meeting.)

Respectfully submitted,  
Glenys Gibson  
Anne Quéma  
Jim MacLeod

**Senate Committee on the Library**  
**Report to Senate**  
**May 2017**

This past academic year, the Library Committee has met twice, considering both administrative issues pertinent to the committee and programs of the library.

Most Senate Committees elect their own chair, however, for some years now, the Chair of the Library Senate Committee has been elected by the Nominating Committee of the Senate. The Committee agrees that this should change and a request for a proposed motion will be made to the Bylaws Committee.

The Committee agreed that the present mandate of the committee remain as is from changes made last year.

The Committee received presentations from Library staff regarding Acadia Scholar: Institutional Repository, Open Access, and Research Data Management. The new Leisure Reading Collection: Garden of Reading, is now in place at the Vaughan Memorial Library, in partnership with the Annapolis Valley Regional Library.

Acadia Scholar (Institutional Repository) is now up and running. This year we have focussed on moving the theses and dissertations into Acadia Scholar from Content DM with supervisors added and metadata updated. This means there are 1422 theses in total in Acadia Scholar. Acadia Scholar is now taking data, which accompanies theses, and we are developing a collection of honours projects. We currently have 5 digital collections in Acadia Scholar to test the functionality of it in handling archival collections. There are 31 citations in Acadia Scholar with some accompanying full-text.

Regarding Open Textbooks, the Committee learned that an “Open Text Book” is a text book with an “open license”. They are available electronically (born digital), but can be made print. Open Text Books are considerably less expensive than traditional text books, and can be adapted to suit the needs of whomever adopts it. CAUL (Council of Atlantic University Libraries) has produced a survey which

will soon be sent out to Universities and Community Colleges, to determine who is already using Open Text Books, as well as why and how.

Finally, the Committee received an overview from the Acting University Librarian about the “Acadia Reads” initiative. This program will encourage the Acadia community to share their love of books by reading the assigned novel or graphic novels and participating in programming surrounding the books. This is an opportunity for the entire campus to build bridges between books and people and to embark collectively upon the exploration of ideas through literature. A committee made up of Librarians, the Dean of Arts, and students established a long-list of books written by Canadian authors that will be voted on by the community.

Finally, the Committee noted the need to continue to review the needs of the Library building, as critical issues of space, etc. emerge.

Respectfully submitted,

William Brackney, for the Committee

Amitabh Jha

Kendra Carmichael

John Murimboh

Senewa Sena

Chris Thomas

Glenn Wooden

Michele Boyd

Brianna Jarvin

Robert Pitter

Ann Smith, Acting Librarian

Stephanie Todd

Kelly Bennett, Recording Secretary



**SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (ADMINISTRATIVE) REPORT, MAY 3, 2017****Membership**

Jeff Banks (Acting Registrar, non-voting), Paul Callaghan (FPS, Chair), Glenys Gibson (FPAS, Secretary), Brianna Jarvin (SRC – VP Academic), Diemo Landgraf (FA), Rob Raeside (Chair, Curriculum Committee Policy), Jennie Rand (FPAS), Patricia Rigg (FA), Ann Smith (Library), and John Guiney Yallop (FPS).

**Note:** Lisa Caldwell & Shawna Singleton of the Registrar's Office actively participated in the process of reviewing curriculum change proposals.

**Mandate**

- 1) to oversee and co-ordinate all proposed changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 2) to identify issues arising as a result of recommended changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, and to forward issues to relevant bodies for consideration and action.
- 3) to consider all changes in undergraduate courses from all departments or schools, or from any individual concerning changes in the curriculum, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 4) to collaborate with the Registrar's office to produce the programs of study and course listings sections of the annual Calendar.
- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

**Meeting Dates 2016-2017:** September 23<sup>rd</sup>, December 7<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Summary of Work of Committee**

During the September meeting the mandate of the committee was reviewed, and future meeting dates were set, and a Chair was selected. During the December meetings curriculum proposals received from the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science were reviewed. An overview of the number and type of curriculum proposals submitted for the committee's consideration is summarized below;

Type of Proposal	Faculty			TOTAL
	Arts	Pure & Applied Science	Professional Studies	
New Course (Form 1)	6	1	0	7
Course Deletion (Form 2)	12	2	0	14
Course Modification (Form 3)	64	49	5	118
Program Modification (Form 4)	12	6	0	18
<b>Totals:</b>	94	58	5	157

In its review, the committee designated each proposal as; (i) acceptable as is ("no issues"), (ii) minor editing required by the committee related to non-substantive issues such as oversights in completing forms, language conventions, or (iii) required clarification and/or adjustments through consultation with the Director or Head of the relevant academic unit. All proposals designated as type (iii) were successfully resolved during the period leading up to the December break. A report titled *2016/17 Proposals for Curriculum Changes* (dated January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2017) was prepared for the January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of Senate. Having secured Senate approval, the curriculum

changes outlined in that report have subsequently been implemented by the Registrar's office (i.e. now reflected in the 2017/18 Academic Calendar and Eden).

During the 2016/17 cycle of developing, documenting and reviewing curriculum changes, the SCC has identified several limitations in the forms used to document curriculum change proposals. In consultation with the Registrar's office, these limitations will be addressed by the SCC in advance of the 2017/18 cycle of processing curriculum changes.

Respectfully submitted, Paul Callaghan, Chair of the Curriculum Committee (2016/17)

## AD-HOC DIVERSITY & INCLUSION COMMITTEE

Report to Senate – May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017

### Committee Members as of April 30, 2017

Maggie Neilson, Chair (Faculty of Pure & Applied Science)

Dr. Jeffrey Hennessy (Dean, Faculty of Arts)

Dr. Erin Wunker (Faculty of Arts)

Dr. Stephen MacLean (Faculty of Professional Studies)

Klara Ganslandt (Student representative)

### Update

Beginning in February, the Ad-Hoc Diversity & Inclusion Committee has met three times (once per month): February 6<sup>th</sup>, March 22<sup>nd</sup>, and April 10<sup>th</sup>.

To date, the Committee has created a list of key groups and individuals on campus with whom to engage. This list built upon those groups and individuals suggested in the Diversity & Inclusion Committee mandate. After identifying all those who would have a role within the broad scope of diversity and inclusion on campus, the Committee crafted a letter of invitation to send to each. Either individuals or member of the identified groups were invited to participate in informal, semi-structured conversation to discuss goals and strategies, the challenges they've experienced, and their vision for Acadia and its community members. These conversations are expected to be held throughout the spring and summer.

The next stage of compiling a list of recommendations to University Senate is gathering feedback from the broader Acadia community. The Committee has been discussing the best strategy for acquiring this input, including a social media campaign or a survey. This strategy will be further developed over the summer and launched in the fall.

Finally, the Committee will work throughout the next year conducting an informal scan of best practices and initiatives piloted or adopted (surrounding diversity and inclusion) by post-secondary institutions similar to Acadia University. This will not, however, exclude any valuable examples that might come from larger institutions. For the purposes of maintaining focus and efficiency, undergraduate-focused universities will be targeted.

The Ad-Hoc Diversity & Inclusion Committee has also engaged with the Presidential Advisory Council on Decolonization through attendance and observation of decolonization conversations across campus. Further collaboration is anticipated over the next year as both groups work towards developing recommendations.

Respectfully submitted by Maggie Neilson