

Office of the Senate Secretariat

Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia
Canada B0P 1X0

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



Minutes of the Special Senate Meeting of Tuesday June 22nd, 2021.

A special meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Tuesday June 22nd, 2021 beginning at 9:00 a.m., with Chair A. Kiefte presiding and 46 Senators present with one guest. The meeting took place virtually using Microsoft Teams due to the COVID pandemic University operations.

1) Approval of Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order, noting that there was quorum at present.

Motion to approve the agenda. Moved by M. Robertson and seconded by J. Dymont.

MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA CARRIED.

2) Announcements

The Chair noted the following regrets: Z. Whitman, C. Morley, C. Callbeck, S. McMullen, T. Surette. M. Adam and J. Colton would be joining the meeting late. N. Kennedy and M. Cyr would be leaving the meeting early. N. D'Amato was attending as a guest.

3) New Business:

a) Presentation of the Academic Plan (PPT attached and circulated)

The Chair explained that D. Keefe would provide a 30 minute presentation of the revised Academic Plan document. Senators would then be invited to discuss the document and presentation.

D. Keefe provided context and reminded Senators that this document was connected to the 2025 Acadia Strategic Plan, formally launched last Fall. The 'ideas booklet' had suggested various initiatives for the coming years, some of which were included in the Acadia Strategic Plan. Some others were included in this Academic Plan.

D. Keefe noted the work that the APC had been involved with recently and stated that the Academic Plan would drive the mission of the Institution and the decision-making about priorities as it lead into budgets for the next several years.

D. Keefe stated that eight of the strategic directions and strategic goals connected into the Academic Plan. These had already been presented at the recent Town Hall meeting. The APC had looked at how to feed into these

and developed five academic initiatives to support the strategic goals within the Acadia Strategic Plan.

D. Keefe emphasised that this was an iterative approach and was not set in stone. These were areas to be advanced but changes would be made as necessary as units proceeded through the Academic Plan. He described the following:

- Grow and diversify undergraduate enrolment to 4000 by 2025/26 in order to provide resources for new initiatives
- Enhance Transformational Student Experiences which was key to what a residential campus provided in terms of experience for the students
- Revitalize the Academic Sector for the transforming 21st Century World
- Enhance recognition of research and scholarly activity with better celebration and promotion of this area
- Support teaching and learning excellence

D. Keefe reported that limited feedback had been received from the Faculty of Arts, some from the Faculty of Professional Studies, and no feedback from the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science.

D Keefe pointed out that there was no uniform agreement but that several concerns had already been addressed.

D. Keefe stated that in terms of concerns some were not happy with the short turn-around time but he noted that the University was already into the first year of a five year plan. Approval of the Academic Plan will be delayed until the September meeting of Senate to allow more time for units to develop their own academic plans and unit reports.

D. Keefe commented that some felt that the Plan was too focussed on enrolment growth but he pointed out that the current funding model required enrolment to grow in order to provide the much needed resources. Concerns about space on campus had been studied and it was felt that there was enough available for 4000 students. This did require the available space to be used effectively so that the right classes were in the right classrooms.

D. Keefe noted concerns about reliance on quantitative performance indicators but he stated that there was not an expectation that units needed to meet the performance indicators, or that they would be punitive. These were intended as an assessment tool for the initiatives and strategies in order for the University to assess whether things were working over the next several years. This information would then feed into the next Strategic Plan.

D. Keefe stated that not every unit was expected to contribute to the new initiatives of the Institution. Concerns had been raised about the number of Teaching Chairs because this could result in fewer faculty teaching courses, but he noted that some could be externally funded or funded internally with course release. This would allow Acadia to enhance teaching and learning and link to the creation of the Centre for Teaching and Learning. Micro credentials had

been criticized and the language had been changed to reflect this. There were opportunities to contribute locally to areas that might justify micro credentials.

D. Keefe clarified that a review of course pre-requisites would take place. This did not require pre-requisites to be removed from courses, it was just a desire to look at the current pre-requisites to see if relevant ones were in place for the programs of today. He did not want unnecessary barriers to be placed that prevented students from trying courses outside of their discipline. This would encourage exploration and allow students to appreciate different perspectives.

D. Keefe reported that a variety of comments and feedback had been received regarding three terms or four terms, not all positive, but he noted that there were opportunities for students to spread their work out and could also help faculty with their research by providing opportunities during different times in the annual calendar. This was just an initiative to be explored.

D. Keefe had received comments that faculty and staff were being asked to do more with less but he noted that increasing revenues was the way to improve this balance.

D. Keefe noted that cultural competency and graduate attributes were important and an opportunity to articulate the value of a liberal education.

D. Keefe stated that supportive comments had also been received. It was felt that the document contained fine ideas; support was expressed for open educational resources, reducing unnecessary pre-requisites, and the three-term model.

D. Keefe pointed out that revisions had been made to the document and that further revisions would be made following the Senate input. This would create an opportunity to celebrate what Acadia was doing. This was a multi-year plan and would not happen overnight. He expected that all units would be able to contribute to the Academic Plan.

D. Keefe reminded Senators that Senate had approved the requirement for the Provost and VPA Office to provide both a pre-budget and a post-budget report. He expected that in the Fall of 2021, based on the unit plans and the Academic Plan, the Academic Planning Committee would bring forward to Senate a pre-budget report which identified the key issues and resources that needed to be supported by the Institution. Once the budget was finalised in the Spring there would need to be a second report from the Academic Planning Committee to look at how the budget reflected the priorities and initiatives that had been identified in the Fall of 2021. He expected that he would hold the responsibility to ensure that this occurred.

D. Keefe described the next steps based upon the discussion at Senate and the receiving of the unit plans. The APC would be making additional revisions and bringing the Academic Plan back to Senate in September.

D. Keefe concluded his presentation.

b) Academic Plan discussion, comments and feedback:

The Chair asked Senators to add themselves to the speakers list. She stated that D. Keefe would be responding to comments after every few speakers.

Anthony Pash asked for the Library to be given opportunity to provide feedback once H. Saunders assumed her position at Acadia.

C. Shields commented that this Academic Plan would eventually drive the budget but that budgetary constraints still existed. He noted the concerns from Kinesiology with respect to high enrolment and the potential for enrolment to increase further because of the capacity for growth in that area. While the School had capacity for growth they did not have the necessary resources for further growth. Kinesiology faculty were also concerned about the evaluation metrics that would be used when evaluating research input and output because these referred to tri-Council grants, whereas much of the research work in Kinesiology was applied and community based, which leveraged small grants that were not from the Tri-Council. C. Shields pointed out that Kinesiology punched above its weight in that area.

G. Whitehall pointed out that this would eventually become a Senate document and that it was a radical break from Acadia's tradition. It proposed a different way to think about academic planning. He did not feel that the Academic Plan developed the specifics of a Liberal Arts education and felt it to be more of a marketing strategy for the University and a business plan. G. Whitehall did not feel that enrolment belonged here but should be part of a business plan and that this would be better handled by the administration.

G. Whitehall agreed that if a suitable Academic Plan was created which required the Administration to fully resource units to cope with additional enrolment numbers, this would be workable. He was concerned that having an enrolment objective but no commitment to increase teaching resources would create problems and result in additional .17 PCAs and CLTs.

G. Whitehall felt that pages 5-14 which covered the environmental scan, did not belong in the Academic Plan. These were questions for the Board to consider. He stated that Acadia's Academic Plan should be compared with other Academic Plans from similar institutions.

G. Whitehall felt that the Academic Plan should include steps to describe a mechanism of how ideas would filter in and be discussed. He voiced his concern about any idea to remove all pre-requisites from programs.

G. Whitehall believed that core values ought to be included in the Academic Plan, such as program viability. He also wished to see diversity targets put in place both for faculty representation and course diversification. G. Whitehall was looking for information on how the University would support the connection between teaching and research and asked what sort of investment would be made in this area.

G. Whitehall also asked about developing a vibrant research culture which he did not see in the document and he felt that the Academic Plan was outward facing rather than investing in faculty directly. He noted that the faculty

needed to be rejuvenated on campus and be given opportunities to allow them to flourish in teaching, research and service.

D. Keefe responded to the previous three Senators.

D. Keefe agreed that H. Saunders would have opportunity to contribute to the Academic Plan. Research Services would be able to work with H. Saunders on input to the APC and he noted that she would also be a member of this committee.

D. Keefe responded to C. Shields and addressed the issue of capacity in some large programs, acknowledging that programs could not be expected to keep growing without placing resources therein. Capacity was not just market capacity but also whether or not there was internal resource capacity. He noted C. Shields comments around Tri-Council funding and stated that although this was important to the University, other research funding would also be supported and observed.

D. Keefe reminded G. Whitehall that there had never been any intent to remove all pre-requisites from courses or programs, as he had stated earlier. Programs were merely being asked to review their existing pre-requisites. On the issue of enrolment, D. Keefe did not feel that this could be divorced from an Academic Plan and felt that it would be naïve to believe that enrolment was solely the premise of the Board. The Academic Sector needed to provide input into any plan to alter registration numbers.

D. Keefe stated that a three or four term year had been discussed in a number of different meetings and forums and some had suggested that a better job needed to be done in utilizing Acadia's resources all year round.

D. Keefe asked G. Whitehall why he had not submitted his comments to the Academic Planning Committee when he had been asked to do so because they would have been helpful to the committee.

H. Teismann pointed out that in Science they were focussing on getting their unit plans ready for the APC so did not provide comments to the APC at this stage. He noted that there was a gap in the Academic Plan because there was no mention about technology and no description of what the technology profile might be in the next five years. He pointed out that it was essential to have an on-line presence and expected that students would want to have increased flexibility with how they took Acadia's programs.

D. Looker thanked D. Keefe for having an Academic Plan. She referred to the important role of research at the University and the knowledge creation that resulted. She felt that Acadia tended to focus on undergraduate education when it came to planning, but she highlighted the need to attract world class faculty who would give undergraduate students the sort of experience that they needed. In order to do this faculty needed to be actively involved in their research and the University needed to find ways to actively support research and to increase funding from the Tri-Councils. D. Looker noted that Acadia was currently 19th out of 19 with SSHRC funding. The Plan needed concrete

suggestions as to how the faculty could be moved forward so that they were more successful in getting funding.

C. Rushton thanked D. Keefe for the document and was glad that it was not set in stone and expected that changes would continue to be made. C. Rushton stated that in order to grow the academic sector it was also essential to grow the support services around it in areas such as Counselling, International Support, and Equity and Diversity Resources. These were currently insufficient for the students that Acadia already had on campus.

C. Rushton also discussed space allocation and noted that in the case of Music, National standards for space were not being met, and that space allocation for various disciplines was definitely an issue on campus.

D. Keefe responded to the previous three Senators.

D. Keefe agreed that the Academic Plan did not mention technology much at this point. He stated that the Institute of Teaching and Learning would have a role in that area and that additions would be added to the final draft.

D. Keefe responded to D. Looker and thanked her for the comments on research and for highlighting that Acadia stood 19th out of 19 for SSHRC awards. He noted how important the role of research was at Acadia and noted that a Research Plan was in the works and that he would ask A. Redden to speak to this later.

D. Keefe acknowledged to C. Rushton, that although a high level study of space on campus had been conducted, there would still be areas of concern regarding space in some units such as Music and Kinesiology. This would provide constraints for each individual programs.

D. Keefe agreed that support services were needed to support higher enrolment and he noted that S. Duguay was involved on this front. In order to provide resources to support those initiatives it was essential to grow revenue at Acadia by increasing enrolment.

A. Redden thanked D. Looker and D. Keefe for their comments. She noted that the Research Committee was developing a focus on mentorship for faculty early career researchers. A survey would be circulated shortly and a revised Strategic Research Plan would be created. She also described initiatives by the Maple League collaboration. Acadia had set up a network for the CRCs in the Maple League.

A. Redden explained that there would be collaboration with a Ph.D. program at MUN whereby Acadia faculty could be principal supervisors of students that were attending MUN. The Maple League had met with the leads from MUN and later in the summer A. Redden would be creating an MOU. She noted that St. F.X. had also done this.

A. Redden noted that Acadia and Research & Graduate Studies did a good job of celebrating the more applied research which tended to have more media appeal. She encouraged faculty to look for diversity when applying for

funding. There was also a review system for grant applications to be put in place to help to improve the percentage of applications that were successful.

J. Dyment raised questions from Education. A strong and vibrant graduate program existed with over 1700 enrolments in courses a year and she felt that the Academic Plan mentioned little with respect to graduate planning.

J. Dyment asked about faculty renewal and what sort of targets would be set to address the proposed increase in enrolment. J. Dyment pointed out that 70% of courses in the School of Education graduate programs and 65% in the B.Ed. were taught by part-time lecturers.

D. Seamone stated that she had previously asked about the fast timeline. She noted that this seemed too rapid when everyone was still in crisis mode and running on empty. D. Seamone commented that faculty wanted to have time and an opportunity to discuss what a liberal education really was. While she appreciated this opportunity at Senate and noted that the Faculty of Arts had also held a meeting to discuss this, she still felt that the COVID bubble existed and that September was too early to be voting on the Academic Plan.

D. Seamone asked that the academic plans from the units be allowed more time because currently they were being asked to submit a plan to a document that was not yet final or approved. No text had been provided to describe the relationship between departmental reviews and this new process. D. Seamone appreciated the points raised by G. Whitehall. She noted that the sunset clause had been removed but felt that the structure that the sunset clause fit into still remained. She highlighted the last sentence in the document that stated “*Resource allocation will be prioritized to Programs, Centres/Institutes, and Other Academic Initiatives that contribute to the Strategic and Academic Plan*”. D. Seamone asked that some of the softer talk that D. Keefe was providing in person be included in the text of the Academic Plan.

S. Currie provided perspective from the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science and as a member of the Academic Planning Committee. She noted that departments and schools were very busy preparing their unit plans and that many discussions had been held with the Heads and Directors in Science.

S. Currie felt that holistic planning was underway and that in Science they saw this exercise as a part of the environmental scan. She stated that the unit plans would help to inform the overarching Academic Plan document. S. Currie appreciated having the extra time through the summer but she also recognized the need to operationalize the Academic Plan. She expected that conversations would be ongoing but that a course needed to be set.

S. Currie had received extensive feedback from faculty and noted that without feedback directions would be decided by fewer people. Higher Education was in a precarious position and in particular the smaller liberal arts universities, so it was important to decide on a course. Without a clear Academic Plan the academic mission might not be prioritized in the Strategic Plan.

S. Currie noted that matching growth and resources was very important and she also supported finding ways to support faculty research. She agreed with the comments on technology and the Library learning resources.

D. Keefe responded to the previous three Senators.

D. Keefe agreed that it was important to make a start on the process but noted that it would be iterative. Although it was a lot of work to do the first time around he hoped that it could be looked at annually. This would allow the Academic Plan to drive the financial decisions.

D. Keefe felt that some of the challenges were because the University had gone so long between a Strategic Plan.

D. Keefe agreed with J. Dymant that there was not much on graduate programs but pointed out that graduate programs would not be a high priority for the next several years. He recognised that the focus in the School of Education would be different.

D. Keefe stated that faculty renewal would be looked at as input was received from the academic units, so that the current needs could be assessed.

J. Colton had served on the APC and appreciated the efforts undertaken by this committee. He noted that Community Development faculty had met to discuss the Academic Plan and pointed out a number of things to be considered.

- Building cultural competency
- Developing micro credentials
- Increasing international students
- Creating more flexibility around additional terms and considering reaching out to other groups of students, e.g. mature students, single parents
- Becoming more inclusive
- Expanding Open Acadia to become a Teaching and Learning Centre

J. Colton described key performance indicators and asked how the depth of partnerships could be considered, as opposed to the number of partnerships. He also asked how that information would be used when compared to other units on campus. He noted that in a program such as Community Development there was little space in the Academic Plan to explore the qualitative dimensions of the program.

J. Colton reported that Community Development faculty and students had just presented an international workshop at a conference that had been planned for Nairobi, Kenya. This was on the topic of transformative education and the developing of passionate communities of learning. He noted that this was a hard thing to describe and noted that in general it was not possible to place a label on this type of teaching and learning. J. Colton pointed out that there were unique opportunities in this type of Education.

J. Colton felt that demographic trends would be a challenge to increasing enrolment and could result in a lowering of standards and difficulty in retaining students.

J. Colton referred to the Centre for Teaching and Learning and cautioned that Open Acadia had been fantastic at providing support both in the long and short term, but that as the University transitioned to a Teaching and Learning Centre approach, high level support would be needed in a leadership role. Acadia had tended to second faculty to this position, but he pointed out that there was a whole profession of educators who focussed on this out in the field.

L. Robinson thanked everyone for bringing their perspectives to the Academic Plan and pointed out that this demonstrated how much faculty cared about the end result. She stated that a plan was needed and recognized that it would not be perfect but would remain iterative. L. Robinson noted that many conversations had been held at many different levels, beginning with the ideas booklet, and she felt that the document would reflect where Acadia wanted to be in several years' time.

L. Robinson stated that there was a need to plug into the overall Strategic Plan by having an Academic Plan, and therefore driving the academic mission on the campus. Budgetary decisions needed to follow the Academic Plan.

L. Robinson was pleased to see the focus on cultural competencies, equity and diversity, a renewed focus on Arts and Education, and students able to take courses outside of their programs.

V. Provencal shared great concerns about the wording and intent of the final three paragraphs of the Academic Plan. He was particularly concerned about the Performance Indicators paragraph which included the statement "*It is recognized that not all academic units and programs will be involved in each of the initiatives and strategies above, but units/programs will need to make strategic decisions of how to best advance the actions of this Plan*".

V. Provencal noted that the dominating metric for success was increased enrolment and retention. He felt that this was irrespective of disciplinary practice. V. Provencal did not feel that teaching excellence should be measured by retention or by student satisfaction.

V. Provencal suggested that ordinarily faculty were not directly assessed based on these types of plans, but that the Plan stated that the Provost, Deans, Director of Open Acadia, and the Registrar would establish annual priorities for their units and be accountable to the Provost to advance the five initiatives in the Plan. He noted that the Provost would hold an annual meeting day that would report on the achievement of the initiatives. V. Provencal asked for clarification on this structure because it appeared to be administrative and corporate.

V. Provencal saw this as an administrative intersession upon Senate's collegiality. He asked whether the Provost would revisit this structure and recognise collegiality, and make it a Senatorial committee. He proposed a

committee with representation from the units and the faculties. Members of the administration would sit on the committee as non-voting members and be mainly responsible for adding input and implement any decisions coming from the Senatorial committee.

J. Banks discussed the restructuring of Open Acadia and pointed out that this occurred several years earlier. There had been duplication between Open Acadia and the Registrar's Office and to address this some staff were transferred to the Registrar's Office, while Open Acadia became more involved with helping the campus with learning technologies.

J. Banks explained that an Instructional Designer had been hired, D. Pierce, and programming began to be offered in 2017, starting with workshops. These resources were fortunately in place prior to the COVID pandemic. J. Banks expected that this role would continue and that there would be formal recognition of this in the future.

D. Keefe responded to the previous three Senators.

D. Keefe agreed with J. Banks' comments and noted that there was both an outreach function and an internal support function involved. A Centre for Teaching and Learning would provide more prominence and support.

D. Keefe explained to V. Provencal that units would need to make strategic decisions and that this was the point of having an Academic Plan and a Strategic Plan. The Academic Planning Committee would use the Academic Plan when units were making requests, and would consider whether those requests supported the objectives of the Academic and Strategic Plans.

D. Keefe stated that accountability was needed in terms of setting objectives and monitoring them to be certain that the University was advancing. Reflection would be needed at the end of each year to decide what worked and what needed to be changed.

D. Keefe commented that Senate would decide who would Chair a committee. The Provost chaired the APC at the direction of Senate and Senate was free to alter the By-laws if desired.

R. Newman thanked Senators for the conversation. She pointed out that a lot of tension and anxiety existed within the faculty around the enrolment part of the Plan. Intentions to increase enrolment caused tension in Psychology because it was already a large unit and was under resourced. Although Senior Administration had stated that enrolment would be used to drive resources, she remained very aware that her academic unit had seen a large increase during the last 10 years and that the unit had not seen a corresponding increase in resources in terms of faculty, administrative staff, and teaching assistants.

R. Newman highlighted that it was not possible to deal with additional students, and stated that there were no offices available for new faculty, there was no additional research space, and honours students could not be accommodated because they did not have a thesis supervisor available. All faculty had one or more honours students already. R. Newman pointed out

that although there were sufficient classrooms on campus, there were insufficient large classrooms to cover the classes of 150+ students. There were problems in the scheduling for the coming year.

R. Newman explained that in some units faculty felt a sense of threat that if enrolment was not increased then their courses could be cancelled. These smaller programs were programs that taught a great deal of service courses. R. Newman felt that the Academic Plan did not address these concerns. COVID had also driven anxiety.

R. Newman discussed faculty renewal, enrolment and curriculum renewal, and stated that in a recent workshop experts had discussed building a diverse and inclusive psychology curriculum. They had warned that before building a diverse student body it was essential to have both the faculty and the curriculum in place.

P. Arnold commented that enrolment needed to play a part in Academic Planning. In Engineering, there might be capacity in general but the distribution between programs was uneven and they had struggled to find classrooms sufficiently large and suitable for the first-year classes. He felt that a dialogue between those departments that were at capacity and the Administration would be useful; to discuss what collectively it was felt the enrolment should be at each department or school level. It was also important to maintain balance between the three Faculties.

A. Quema was serving on the APC and disagreed with some of the elements of the Academic Plan. A. Quema believed that the Academic Plan determining budgetary decisions was important. However, the Plan also stated that budgetary decisions would be made on how academic unit plans met certain expectations. A. Quema saw this as a contradiction.

A. Quema stated that in the Faculty of Arts there was resistance to meeting the July 1st, 2021 deadline to provide a unit plan because it was felt that it was unclear what was expected by the Academic Planning Committee. Faculty were also worried because of the metrical approach of the Academic Plan.

A. Quema suggested that the University slow down and look first at the unit plans as they came forward, following which the Academic Plan could be revised.

D. Keefe responded to the previous three Senators.

D. Keefe agreed with R. Newman and P. Arnold that it was recognised that there were capacity issues within certain academic units. He expected that the ACE Colleague software 'Info Silo' would help to manage the timetable and classroom assignments in order to optimize space.

D. Keefe noted that the unit reports would demonstrate which programs were already at capacity and that there was a possibility of enrolment caps for these programs.

D. Keefe felt that A. Quema had summed up the reality for many and for the University. He wanted the academic units, the APC and the Senate to have a more active role in the decision-making. This would require a strategic approach as there were insufficient resources to cover every ask.

K. Pinder thanked Senators for their comments and agreed that the Academic Plan should drive the University budget. She asked for the unit plans to be provided with an extension. She noted that faculty were exhausted and that some units were reluctant to put a plan forward at this point.

K. Pinder pointed out that faculty were well aware that there were limited resources and had been living with this reality for many years. It was not necessary to underline this fact. She stated that if a unit had a really well thought out, reasonable, and sound academic proposal that did not fit within the framework of the Academic Plan, there were valid concerns as to how this would be received.

K. Pinder asked how the unit reviews would fit with the already existing program reviews. She also noted that units could carry out their own review of pre-requisites and that it did not need to be a University-wide approach.

K. Pinder found that criticisms of the Academic Plan were being received in a stubborn manner and she noted that comments she had provided had been taken out of context and viewed as a criticism, an example being a comment she provided with respect to Teaching Chairs. She was in favour of Teaching Chairs but recognised that it would be hard for sufficient faculty to be available to teach classes.

K. Pinder felt that there were several other paths that could be taken to bring together research and teaching in an innovative way by considering course releases for faculty that wanted to work on course development and design.

M. Adam appreciated the earlier comments of Senators and also thanked the APC for taking this on. M. Adam noted comments made by G. Whitehall that this document would ultimately become a Senate document. M. Adam questioned the role of Senate and the role of this document and which part of the document contained strong and important administrative goals.

M. Adam referred to the Executive Summary on page 2 of the Academic Plan and felt that the last two bulleted initiatives were the ones that spoke to the Academy: *Enhance Recognition of Research and Scholarly Activity, and Support Teaching and Learning Excellence.*

M. Adam pointed out that everyone understood the need for enrolment but that there was a trust issue that was central to these conversations and remained the elephant in the room. He did not feel that faculty could look at the Academic Plan as a whole and feel safe because of historical communication from the Administration. Intentions of the Administration were not being communicated and were not trusted. M. Adam wanted to be part of the solution but the metrics of the document raised concerns.

C. Mutlu noted that enrolment was a central part of the Academic Plan. Responsibility for the success of an enrolment plan was being shifted from the Administration and to the Academic Sector. This made it appear that if it failed, it would be because of actions carried out by the academic units. C. Mutlu asked who would be responsible if Acadia did not succeed in growing the enrolment number to 4000.

C. Mutlu asked about costs that would be incurred in increasing enrolment. He pointed out that he could work at Acadia for 30 years but that Administrators tended to move from Institution to Institution every few years. He saw 4000 as an arbitrary number and asked how the Administration would be assessed on their own performance with respect to the success of the Academic Plan.

C. Mutlu also requested an extension be allowed for the unit plans and he felt that more conversation and consultation needed to be held.

D. Keefe responded that the Deans would be forwarding the unit plans to the APC at the end of August. If extra time was still needed the Deans all served on the APC.

D. Keefe acknowledged the lack of trust issue but felt that the Plan was very transparent and open. Enrolment of 4000 was a round number but was also something that would be looked at annually to check that the University was progressing towards that number.

D. Keefe stated that enrolment was not divorced from the Academic sector and the sector played an active role in this.

P. Callaghan agreed that enrolment was a must-win battle but he felt that the University needed to bring the students to the University and that the faculty in turn would offer engaging and compelling academic programming and support for students. He had not seen much in the Strategic Plan to offer Academic support for students.

P. Callaghan noted that the market in Business was very competitive and felt that if enrolment numbers could be maintained, he would feel that he had succeeded.

D. Benoit thanked everyone for their comments and opinions and the APC for the work that they had carried out. He noted that there were some issues but was delighted to see the development of the Teaching and Learning Centre, which he had been promoting at Senate for many years. D. Benoit also appreciated that a clear picture would be created to show what everyone needed to do to become and remain sustainable. Having a target was essential in order to plan successfully. D. Benoit noted that when resources were an issue the University needed to be concerned about how it used the precious resources that it did have.

D. Keefe responded to P. Callaghan and D. Benoit and thanked them for their comments. He stressed the need to move forward and appreciated the comments that had been received. D. Keefe stated that the APC would make

further refinements as unit plans were received and expected that the Academic Plan would come back to Senate in September for review.

President Ricketts thanked the Senators for the rich and important discussion that had been held and he also thanked D. Keefe and the APC for the work that had been carried out. The Academic Plan would provide a basis for delivering on the key academic aspects of the Strategic Plan.

President Ricketts was confident that Senate would reach a point of agreeing on the path forward and he felt that everyone was talking about the sustainability of the University.

4) Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 12:02 p.m. Moved by S. Currie.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary