

***The Senate of Acadia University acknowledges that we are located in Mi'kma'ki, the ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq People.***

Minutes of the Special Senate Meeting of Wednesday, May 27, 2026.

A Special meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Wednesday, May 27, 2026, beginning at 4:00 p.m., with Chair A. Kiefte presiding. The meeting took place via Microsoft Teams.

Chair A. Kiefte welcomed participants and called the meeting to order.

### **Approval of Agenda**

**Motion to approve the agenda. Moved by E. Callaghan and seconded by D. Benoit.**

A. Kiefte announced that the agenda would be updated to include Announcements as an item and asked if there were any further amendments.

J. Sachs stated that his proposed agenda items had been removed from the draft agenda and he had not been consulted beforehand. He understood the rationale given the special meeting's focus. He hoped that the item could be considered at a future Senate meeting.

A. Kiefte responded that she was not prepared to guarantee the item would appear on a future agenda.

J. Sachs stated that, if he chose to bring the item forward again in the future, he hoped the Chair would consult with the proposing Senator before deciding whether to accept or reject it for the agenda.

A. Kiefte responded that she had already provided J. Sachs with the rationale for removing the item through their prior direct communication and had also sent a communication to Senate yesterday about the nature of today's meeting in which she communicated that she had removed the item. She indicated that she could either restate it at this meeting with further details or discuss it further in an e-mail or other conversation.

J. Sachs did not request that the rationale be further communicated at the meeting.

**MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED CARRIED.**

### **Announcements**

A. Kiefte announced regrets from Kelly Brenton (who might arrive late), Hassouna Moussa, Joe Hayes, Celine Hoyeck, Remmi Boisjoli, Jesica Slights, Howard Williams, Glenys Gibson, and Darren Kruisselbrink. She also noted that Cassel Busse would be leaving early.

She welcomed several non-voting guests attending on behalf of absent Senators, including Chris Shields for D. Kruisselbrink, Randy Newman for J. Hayes, H el ene d'Entremont for G. Gibson, and Kait Pinder for J. Slights.

A. Kieft informed Senate that documentation from the recent Faculty Council meeting had been circulated at the request of a Faculty Council member who was also a Senator. She noted that she had consulted the movers of the Motions that were being circulated before sharing the relevant materials to seek their consent and had also circulated what was believed to be the final amended version of Motion 1.

D. Seamone advised that the circulated wording was incomplete. Having reviewed the meeting recording, the amendment passed by Faculty Council differed from the version reflected in the chat and that the wording she provided accurately reflected the Motion adopted at the meeting.

A. Kieft noted that confusion appeared to have arisen from differences between wording posted in the chat and wording adopted verbally during the meeting. She indicated that she would communicate the issue to the Motion movers and Chair of Faculty Council to ensure the correct version of the Motion was known and reflected in the Faculty Council Minutes.

D. Seamone apologized for not raising the matter sooner, explaining that she had only discovered the discrepancy after reviewing the recording in preparation for this meeting.

J. Hennessy informed Senate of a provincial cabinet shuffle, noting that the Honourable Brendan Maguire would retain the Education and Early Childhood Development portfolio, while the new Minister of Advanced Education would be Brian Wong, who had previously held the role and is an Acadia graduate.

## **Main Business**

### **Academic Restructuring Proposal- Discussion and Feedback**

A. Kieft reviewed the discussion procedures for the meeting, noting that there would be a two-minute limit per speaking turn but no limit on the number of speaking turns, provided that overall meeting time permitted more than two speaking turns per person. She indicated that priority would be given to ensuring all speakers had a first opportunity to speak before second and subsequent speaking turns were recognized. She noted that the reflection questions remained unchanged from the previous meeting and that the proposal before Senate was the most recent version circulated on May 20.

E. Curry stated that she was hesitant to provide feedback on the restructuring proposal because questions she had previously emailed to Dr. Hennessy and Dr. Cunsolo about the development process and incorporation of feedback had not yet been answered. She expressed concern that ideas she had raised in earlier discussions appeared in the proposals without sufficient clarity regarding how feedback was being interpreted or used. She noted that the lack of transparency around the process created a trust issue and that meaningful participation required a clearer understanding of how feedback would be assessed and incorporated. As an academic, she had strong professional concerns about the process.

J. Colton expressed concern that the pace of the restructuring process had created division within his unit and was straining a previously cohesive program, making it difficult for members to reach consensus on its future direction.

J. Fowles asked how governance and decision-making would function within the proposed larger schools created through the consolidation of several existing schools.

A. Cunsolo explained that individual programs would retain responsibility for curriculum, accreditation, staffing, and related matters, with matters flowing through school-level structures to Faculty Council and Senate. She noted that similar models already exist on campus and that governance details would be further developed during implementation.

J. Hennessy added that any changes to Senate representation arising from the restructuring would be considered by the Senate Bylaws Committee through the normal governance process.

L. Carlsson reported that faculty in the School of Nutrition viewed the third draft as a significant improvement with potential benefits for students. However, she noted concerns about additional layers of governance, the need for adequate support during implementation, and the fact that restructuring decisions may be made before the costs and savings are fully known.

C. Shields stated that he preferred the third proposal but acknowledged that no restructuring model was likely to satisfy everyone. He questioned what would happen if the Board was not satisfied with the restructuring proposal ultimately brought forward, asking what the end goal of the process was if the Board could reject the outcome.

J. Hennessy responded that the intention was to bring a final restructuring proposal to Senate for approval at the next meeting and then forward Senate's decision to the Board. He stated that he expected the Board would take Senate's advice seriously, particularly after substantial deliberation by the academic community, and expressed hope that the Board would give significant weight to Senate's recommendation.

L. Rich emphasized the importance of the restructuring process to students and noted general support among students for the proposal. She stressed the need to ensure that student supports, including accessibility, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion initiatives, and other non-academic services, are adequately maintained and supported throughout any transition.

E. Callaghan stated that the third proposal was an improvement, but she still had concerns about the timeline and the use of inaccurate enrolment data. She questioned aspects of the proposed School of Business and Economics structure, including the profiling of entrepreneurship and the rationale for Economics remaining administratively linked while physically separate. She suggested that, rather than finalizing a proposal immediately, the Board be advised that the university community is continuing to develop and refine a restructuring plan.

J. Sachs raised concerns about the implications of the restructuring proposal for Senate composition and governance, noting that the elimination of the current faculties would require substantial changes to Senate membership and Committee structures. He argued that Senate should determine how representation would be structured under the new model before approval, rather than approving the restructuring first and addressing governance changes later. He cautioned against proceeding without clarity on how Senate would function under the proposed structure.

A. Kiefe noted that Senate governance structure changes were among the matters she had envisioned needing further consideration when she had suggested that a list of action items be

developed for Senate and its Committees. She suggested that a restructuring motion could include either specific principles or an agreed-upon list of governance issues to be addressed, providing clarity about the work Senate and its Committees would need to undertake during implementation.

D. Seamone stated that many faculty members remained concerned about the dissolution of departments and the lack of evidence supporting the proposed restructuring model. She suggested a more clearly defined process for evaluating restructuring options and questioned whether some proposed school structures could limit interdisciplinary collaboration.

R. Newman thanked E. Callaghan for raising concerns about inaccurate data and reported that Psychology faculty had similar concerns about the evidence, financial rationale, and risks associated with the proposal. She stated that Psychology opposed its proposed relocation, arguing that it is fundamentally a scientific discipline and that removing it from a science-based faculty could create reputational and enrolment risks. She also raised concerns about the gendered implications of positioning Psychology outside a science-focused structure.

K. Ashley asked E. Callaghan if she could suggest alternative names for the proposed school, noting her interest in receiving options to replace the entrepreneurship-focused title.

M. Ramsay echoed concerns that the restructuring process was moving too quickly and suggested extending discussions through the summer to allow more time for development. He encouraged exploring alternative structural models, including using existing large units as examples and considering whether some major units could operate independently rather than within a faculty structure.

J. Carlson expressed concerns about the timeline, inaccurate data, and the possibility that the proposal would add rather than reduce administrative layers. He questioned the rationale for adopting a school-based structure, suggested that Department Heads and Assistant Deans might be more appropriate than Directors, and asked whether the proposed schools could be modified or eliminated without Senate approval under the terms of the Collective Agreement. He asked the President and Provost and Vice-President Academic how the proposed schools would be treated under Article 31.51 of the Collective Agreement.

J. Fowles questioned whether the proposed structure would reduce bureaucracy, noting that some programs would gain additional layers of administration through Directors and Assistant Directors. He asked how these proposed roles differed from existing Heads and Directors and suggested that an Assistant Dean model might provide a more direct governance structure.

E. Curry advised that she intended to bring forward an alternative process plan at the June Senate meeting. She proposed establishing an ad hoc Senate Committee to lead the development of a restructuring proposal, arguing that Senate Committees are better suited to do collaborative and generative work. She suggested that the committee be guided by clear goals and timelines and include members with expertise in community-led processes to help rebuild trust and support meaningful engagement.

D. Seamone expressed support for E. Curry's proposed process and emphasized the importance of thoughtful, deliberative change. She questioned whether a revised proposal could realistically be developed by September, noting that many faculty would be away during the summer and that students would not be available to participate in the process.

L. Wilson-Finniss reminded Senators that their responsibility is not only to advocate for their own academic units, but to also consider the long-term sustainability of the University as a whole. While acknowledging concerns about the restructuring process and timeline, she emphasized the urgency created by upcoming Schedule H and budget deadlines, as well as the University's financial challenges. She encouraged continued constructive feedback and solutions-focused discussion, noting that delays could have significant consequences for staff, students, and the institution.

E. Callaghan responded to K. Ashley's earlier comment that she had not yet had an opportunity to consult faculty about alternative naming options for the proposed school. While acknowledging the financial pressures facing the university and the impacts of budget reductions, she emphasized that faculty concerns were not about denying the urgency of the situation, but about ensuring that any major restructuring is supported by sufficient time, evidence, and data to avoid implementing the wrong solution.

K. Pinder noted that some faculty members had expressed concern about the disappearance of the term "Arts" from the proposal. While acknowledging that the term can be interpreted differently across campus, she emphasized that it carries positive meaning and identity for many students, faculty, and disciplines, and cautioned against losing that connection in future messaging and structures.

H. d'Entremont raised concerns about timelines, data accuracy, and naming. She expressed particular concern that the proposed School of Environmental Futures and Sustainability does not reflect the significant role Biology and Chemistry play in preparing students for health-related professional programs and suggested that the naming could create confusion for prospective students seeking pre-medical and related pathways.

D. Duke noted that several Senators had described divisions within their units regarding the restructuring proposal. He asked Senators to share perspectives from colleagues who see opportunities in the proposed changes, suggesting that understanding both supportive and critical viewpoints could help inform the discussion and identify potential benefits of restructuring.

J. Sachs responded that, in his unit, opinions ranged from opposition to any restructuring to cautious acceptance of Proposal 3 as the most workable option presented so far. He also addressed concerns about increased bureaucracy, noting that while the proposal introduces additional administrative roles, positions such as Assistant Directors and that Program Coordinators would not receive additional compensation and would operate within existing resource allocations, which he suggested could help address financial pressures.

L. Rich emphasized the importance of keeping students at the center of restructuring discussions. While supporting evidence-based decision-making and meaningful consultation, she noted that students had been mentioned infrequently during this discussion despite being directly affected by ongoing financial pressures and service reductions. She urged Senators to ensure that student perspectives remain a central consideration in any future planning and consultation processes.

E. Boles echoed L. Rich's comments and urged Senators to focus discussions on how restructuring would affect the student experience, recruitment, and retention. She expressed concern that students had not been adequately consulted by many units and noted frustrations with the limited involvement of student voices in restructuring discussions. She encouraged

Senators to ensure that students remain central to conversations about the university's future and the impacts of any proposed changes.

L. Carlsson responded to D. Duke by highlighting potential opportunities she sees in the proposed structure, particularly within the health professions. She noted that bringing programs such as Kinesiology, Nutrition, Nursing, and Counselling together could create richer opportunities for interprofessional learning and collaboration, better reflecting how health professionals work in practice. She suggested that such integration could enhance the student experience and acknowledged H. d'Entremont's concern that some health-related disciplines may not be adequately reflected in the proposed naming structure.

F. Mohammadi expressed concerns about the restructuring process, arguing that meaningful consultation should involve co-creation rather than feedback on a pre-developed proposal. She questioned the evidence supporting the proposed model, raised concerns about impacts on collegial governance and faculty workload, and called for a more collaborative process that includes meaningful student input.

E. Curry thanked the student representatives for their comments and reiterated that her proposed process would be community-led and include student participation. She emphasized that she still lacked clarity about how feedback was being collected, evaluated, and incorporated into proposal revisions. She called for greater transparency regarding the revision process, decision-making criteria, goals, and metrics, and questioned how the university's academic mission and strategic priorities were being incorporated into the restructuring proposals.

C. Haigh echoed comments about the urgency of addressing the university's challenges and the importance of considering the Board Chair's communication to Senate, which the Senate Chair had circulated yesterday. She noted that Proposal 3 includes an extended implementation and review timeline, as well as provisions for ongoing assessment of the academic structure, which she viewed as a strength. She also highlighted that the proposal outlines future consultation opportunities and stated that, in her view, feedback submitted by Senators and other community members had been reflected in the latest version of the proposal.

L. Rich encouraged Senators to share information about upcoming restructuring consultation sessions with students and faculty. She noted that both virtual and in-person sessions would be held, with additional opportunities for students to provide feedback directly. She emphasized the importance of student participation and welcomed efforts to support a community-led consultation process.

P. Ludlow noted that the research landscape is also changing, with funding agencies increasingly prioritizing large, collaborative, and often international research initiatives. He noted that the proposed restructuring could create opportunities to build new interdisciplinary teams and strengthen the University's ability to pursue larger research funding opportunities that have traditionally been less accessible to institutions like Acadia.

R. Newman reflected on comments from student representatives and emphasized that her concerns about the proposal stem from its potential impact on students and enrolment. She argued that Department Heads play an important role in providing direct, relationship-based support to students beyond administrative responsibilities, and expressed concern that the proposed structure could weaken those connections. She asked how the model would

preserve the personalized guidance and support that students currently receive from academic leaders within their units.

K. Ashley suggested that Senate should identify the educational indicators it would use to assess the long-term impacts of any restructuring. She noted that measures such as research activity, strategic alignment, student advising, retention, and the capacity to develop new programs could help evaluate whether the proposed changes support Acadia's academic mission.

J. Carlson thanked the student representatives for emphasizing the importance of student perspectives and argued that meaningful student consultation supported extending the timeline for deliberations. He reiterated concerns about proceeding without clear financial evidence and stressed the importance of a careful process to achieve a sound outcome. He also renewed his request for clarification on how the proposed schools would be treated under Article 31.51 of the collective agreement, particularly whether schools could be significantly modified or terminated without Senate approval.

K. Pinder echoed R. Newman's comments about the value of Department Heads in supporting students and building relationships within academic units. She also noted that, because not all Senators are Department Heads, the ASU may find it more effective to share student consultation information directly with Heads, and she expressed her willingness to help disseminate those communications.

A. Kieft noted that approximately six minutes remained in the meeting and encouraged any Senators who had not yet spoken to take the opportunity to add themselves to the Speakers' List if they wished to speak. She indicated that priority would be given to first-time speakers before returning to Senators seeking additional speaking turns.

D. Benoit agreed with concerns about preserving a clear point of contact for students within Academic Units and noted that the proposed structure could create inconsistencies in how that support is provided. He acknowledged the difficulty of evaluating a broad structural proposal without all implementation details but argued that the university must first determine whether the overall model is workable before refining specific governance, workload, and financial arrangements. He cautioned that delaying action could increase the risk of further budget-driven reductions.

Z. Whitman shared feedback from members of the Indigenous Education Advisory Council, who commended the University community for its efforts and for engaging with change under challenging circumstances. She noted that they viewed Proposal 3 as a positive step and an opportunity to better centre student needs, improve support services, and respond more effectively to the realities of diverse student populations, including mature students, working students, and student parents. She also suggested that the proposal presents an opportunity for Acadia to demonstrate leadership in supporting students and advancing meaningful change.

L. Chondoma urged Senators to recognize the human impact of the University's financial challenges and the urgency conveyed in the Board Chair's letter. She noted that many colleagues, particularly those without the protections of a Collective Agreement, are facing significant uncertainty and are already seeking alternative employment due to concerns about job security. She encouraged Senators to consider the community consequences of further reductions and to approach the discussion with an awareness of the people whose livelihoods may be affected by future decisions.

All participants on the Speakers List for a first speaking turn had now had an opportunity to speak. The end of the scheduled time for the meeting had been reached, and there was no motion to extend the meeting.

### **Other Business**

There was no other business.

### **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn by D. Seamone at 6:03 p.m.

S. Pineo,  
Recording Secretary of Senate and University Secretary

## **Academic Restructuring Proposal- Discussion and Feedback**

### **Guiding/Reflection Questions**

*Note: These questions are not meant to be exhaustive; they are prompts for discussion. These reflection questions have also guided discussions at the Academic Planning Committee (APC) and Academic Program Review Committee (APRC).*

#### **1. Alignment with Academic Mission and Principles**

- In what ways does the proposed restructuring strengthen alignment with the academic mission and strategic directions of Acadia University, and how could this alignment be made more explicit?
- What academic principles (e.g., interdisciplinarity, disciplinary integrity, liberal education, research intensity) are explicitly or implicitly prioritized in this model? How could the proposal make things more explicit to strengthen the final version?
- Are any core academic values put at risk by the restructuring and how will these be monitored?
- Where unit cohesion or organizational clarity could be improved, what refinements would reduce duplication and strengthen complementarity across units?

#### **2. Impact on Students and Programs**

- How will this restructuring affect the coherence, quality, and accessibility of academic programs?
- How can the restructuring be optimized to ensure continuity of programs and strong student support, particularly during transition?
- What specific adjustments would enhance accessibility, advising, and clarity of academic pathways?

#### **3. Disciplinary Integrity and Interdisciplinarity**

- Does the proposed structure appropriately balance disciplinary depth with interdisciplinary collaboration?
- What mechanisms will support meaningful interdisciplinary teaching and research beyond structural change?

#### **4. Academic Governance and Decision-Making**

- How will the restructuring affect Senate structures (committees, faculty councils)?
- Does the new structure clarify or complicate academic decision-making authority?
- How should responsibilities for curriculum and program review be structured and clarified?
- Are units of an appropriate size and scope to enable meaningful participation in decision-making? If not, what adjustments would improve this?

#### **5. Equity, Inclusion, and Indigeneity**

- Could any units or programs serving marginalized communities be disproportionately impacted?

- What opportunities exist to enhance EDI-AR and Indigenization through curriculum and structures?

#### **6. Implementation and Risk**

- What are the biggest academic risks associated with our current structure?
- What strategies could mitigate the most significant implementation challenges (academic, cultural, operational) with the proposed new structure?
- How should implementation be phased to ensure continuity and minimize disruption for students, faculty, and staff?
- What transition supports are essential to success for faculty, staff, students, and academic leaders?

#### **7. Measures of Success and Accountability**

- What indicators could demonstrate progress on strategic alignment, student support, unit cohesion, and inclusive excellence?
- When and how should the new structure be reviewed and adjusted?



Dear Acadia Community,

Since the release of the Restructuring Proposal #2 on April 21, 2026, we have continued to receive rich, diverse, and helpful feedback from students, staff, and faculty. During this round of engagement, we have received the following feedback:

- **Faculty of Arts Heads & Directors:** 1 submission
- **Faculty of Pure & Applied Sciences Heads & Directors:** 1 submission
- **Vaughan Memorial Library and Archives:** 1 submission
- **Unit Heads/Directors:** 15 submissions
- **Individual Faculty Members & Ideas:** 8 submissions
- **Students:** 1 ASU submission and 1 individual student leader submission

We appreciate the time, conversations, dialogue, creativity, and thinking that have gone into this feedback. Building on this, we are pleased to share Restructuring Proposal #3, which incorporates feedback received and aims to support the program clusters directly requested by programs/Heads/Directors themselves. While this proposal continues to build out the new School groupings, and starts to add shape to the required staffing, more work is needed (including consultation with SEIU, AUPAT, Human Resources, and impacted units) before we can finalize both the embedded support model fully and the final costing model – both of which will be shared publicly.

Building on the feedback we have received, we are proposing to create a model with:

- 2 Faculties (with embedded supports) led by 2 Deans;
- 7 Schools led by a combination of 7 Directors; *and*
- In some cases, large and/or accredited programs within these new Schools will be overseen by an Assistant Director (x 8), who reports to the Director.

This model realizes the following changes in academic leadership:

- 3 Faculty Deans reduced to 2 (reduction of 1)
- 9 Directors reduced to 7 Directors (reduction of 2)
- 15 Heads to 0 (reduction of 15)
- 4 Coordinators to 0 (reduction of 4)
- 1 Assistant Dean to 8 Assistant Directors (increase of 7)
- **Total Change: A total reduction of 15 Academic Leadership Positions**



This model provides a much more cost-effective, sustainable, streamlined, nimble, and responsive structure that will reduce bureaucracy, allow for the more equitable allocation of resources, improve oversight, enhance accountability, and maintain disciplinary cohesion in a form that is recognizable and already existing at Acadia.

Also, while some people expressed concerns around the creation of Associate Deans as a new managerial category, we also received feedback that if we want this new model to work, it is important to recognize the changing scope of responsibilities that leaders of these Schools would have.

Our preference remains having the following leadership structure in the academic sector:  
Dean of the Faculty → Associate Dean for each School → Assistant Dean of some programs.

However, we are respecting the feedback received around the lack of readiness for this structure and, as such, are instead proposing to maintain the structure of Dean of the Faculty → Director for each School → Assistant Director for some programs, as we currently have at Acadia.



### Proposal #3: The Proposed Faculties and Schools

We propose the following 2 Faculties and 7 Schools. Each School will maintain a School Council, responsible for academic decision-making at the School level, then feeding up to respective Faculty Councils and then to Senate (following current School structures). Each program within the Schools can choose to create and operate a Program Committee, which will be responsible for the curricular and academic decisions related to each program, moving up to the School Council, Faculty Council, and Senate.

**Please note that the current names will be finalized once market research is completed.**

### Faculty of Health, Environment & Technology<sup>1</sup>

School	Students	Faculty	Ratio	Notes
<b>School of Applied &amp; Integrative Health – Director</b>				This cluster was requested by these four programs in a joint proposal.
<b>Programs</b>				
Kinesiology (Assistant Director)	434	20	21.7	
Nutrition and Dietetics (Assistant Director)	79/4	8	9.9	
Nursing (Assistant Director)	143	11	13	
Counselling (Assistant Director)	100	3.5	28.6	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>17.9</b>	
<b>School of Environmental Futures &amp; Sustainability – Director</b>				Suggestions to group the units with the strongest environmental science focus together (noting that Applied Bioscience is a cross between Biology and Chemistry).
<b>Programs</b>				
Biology (Assistant Director)	389	24	16.2	
ENVS/Geology/ENV Geoscience	85	8	10.6	
Chemistry	64	11	5.8	
Applied Bioscience	11	2	5.5	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>12.2</b>	
<b>School of Data, Science &amp; Technological Innovation – Director</b>				Suggestions received to group Computer Science & Engineering together, and to connect Math & Stats & Physics to this group.
<b>Programs</b>				
Computer Science	139	8	17.4	
Engineering (Assistant Director)	96	6	16	
Mathematics & Statistics	60	14	4.3	
Physics	20	5	4.0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>9.5</b>	
<b>FACULTY TOTALS</b>	<b>1,624</b>	<b>120.5</b>	<b>13.5</b>	

<sup>1</sup> **Note:** Student numbers are from December 1, 2025, and include first majors only. Faculty numbers reflect full-time continuing faculty. CLTs and PCAs are not accounted. Some minor variations may apply to current numbers.



## Faculty of Culture, Society & Entrepreneurship<sup>2</sup>

Suggested Schools/Groupings	Students	Faculty	Ratio	Notes
<b>School of Business, Entrepreneurship &amp; Economics – Director</b> <i>Programs</i>				Economics supported staying in this cluster as an autonomous program.
Business	533	22	24.2	
Economics	19	7	2.2	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>18.7</b>	
<b>School of Creative Communities - Director</b> <i>Programs</i>				CODE, Music, Art, Theatre all opted to stay together in a cluster to continue to strengthen their programs and grow a Creative Industries (name TBD) program.
CODE	115	6	19.2	
Music	50	12	4.2	
Theatre Profs	N/A	2	N/A	
Art Prof	N/A	1	N/A	
Creative Industries (Emerging Program, name TBD)	N/A	N/A	N/A	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>7.9</b>	
<b>School of Education, Behavioural, and Social Sciences - Director</b> <i>Programs</i>				Requests to keep social sciences together are supported, with the addition of Education and Psychology.
Politics	38	9	4.2	
Law & Society	103	1	103	
ESST	38	1.5	25.3	
WGST	9	2	4.5	
Sociology	124	9	13.8	
Education ( <i>Assistant Director</i> )	150	6.5	23.1	
Psychology ( <i>Assistant Director</i> )	360	15	24	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>822</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>18.7</b>	
<b>School of Humanities &amp; Cultures - Director</b> <i>Programs</i>				Requests to keep humanities together are supported.
English	100	16	6.25	
History & Classics (includes CREL)	63/12	12	6.25	
Philosophy	10	4	2.5	
Languages & Literatures	9	4.5	2.0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>5.3</b>	
<b>FACULTY TOTALS</b>	<b>1,723</b>	<b>130.5</b>	<b>13.2</b>	

<sup>2</sup> **Note:** Student numbers are from December 1, 2025, and include first majors only. Faculty numbers reflect full-time continuing faculty. CLTs and PCAs are not accounted. Some minor variations may apply to current numbers.



## **Beyond the Faculties & Schools**

As with Proposal 2, we recognize that this more traditional approach may be disappointing to some who voiced excitement around a more creative structure and identified opportunities for more diverse clusters. Since the release of Proposal 2, we have received suggestions around the creation of **Institutes** (e.g. like the Health and Wellness Institute), which can bring people from across both Faculties to focus on areas of importance to the university and society (suggested examples have included Food and Climate Change to date). These Institutes can support research clusters, encourage new potential programming, support student interests and training, and attract community and industry partnerships. We encourage these discussions to continue and welcome suggestions on critical multi-/poly-/inter-disciplinary topics.

We also continue to encourage discussions within and between the Schools around more inter- and multi-disciplinary partnerships and to explore ideas for program creation and partnership, and we hope that this structure creates an environment in which we can continue to evolve as a university.

Throughout this process, we have also received questions about opportunities for individuals to transfer from current units of appointment into new proposed Schools, based on individual research and teaching expertise. Articles 31.51 and 31.52 of the 17<sup>th</sup> Collective Agreement provide avenues through which individuals can request to transfer their employment to another unit. We recognize there may be individuals on this campus who choose to make this request moving forward, and we are supportive of these discussions.

## **Staffing & Embedded Supports**

### ***Leadership for the Faculties***

- 2 Deans (each responsible for one Faculty)
- 7 Directors (each responsible for one of the 7 Schools)
- 8 Assistant Directors (each responsible for one of the accredited and/or large Programs within Schools)
- 2 Managers of Operations (1 for each Faculty, responsible for logistics, budget support, data and record keeping, building management, project management)

### ***Administrative & Staffing Supports***

- 2 Executive Assistants (each embedded in one of the Faculties, responsible for a cross-trained team of administrative assistants and staff and supports the Deans and Managers)



- Administrative Assistants (distributed throughout the Schools and across the two Faculties, who are responsible for specific roles, but cross-trained within each Faculty)
- Critical Support Staff will continue to be linked to programs and centralized to each Faculty (e.g. placement leads, technicians, etc.)

### ***Faculty-Level Embedded Support***

As we have been proposing since Version 1, and which continues to receive support from staff, students, and faculty, we will develop an embedded supports model to accompany this new structure. These embedded supports will strategically allocate resources and positions directly into each Faculty to support the critical work of recruitment, academic advising, career and experiential learning, student life and accessible learning, external relations, and research, while maintaining linkages to centralized service hubs. This model will be forthcoming, as we finalize the structure of the Schools and embedded programs.

## **Timelines**

We are proposing this plan along with some adjustments from the original timeline to reflect continued feedback, and to align with a strong timeline idea proposal from Science Heads/Directors, with which we agree.

- **May 27: Special Meeting of Senate:** This session will be for *discussion only* of Proposal 3 only, and not for a vote
- **June 17: Regular June Meeting of Senate:** We will bring Proposal 3 (likely with minor amendments from continued feedback) for Senate *approval vote*.
- **June 18-19: Board Retreat:** We will bring Proposal 3 (likely with minor amendments from continued feedback) to the Board for *discussion only*.
- **July: Special Board Meeting:** We will call a special meeting of the Board of Governors for final vote and approval.
- **August 30: Schedule H submission of institutional priorities and strategic plans**
- **October 15: Final Schedule H submission**
- **August 2026-June 2027: Preparing for Implementation:** This includes working through all details related to budget, structure, governance, staffing, and programming, ensuring that students and the student experience are centred in the decision-making.
- **July 1, 2027: New Faculty and School structure in place**
- **2027-2029: Continual Review Period & Finalization:** Continue to review the structures, staffing, and processes via regular check-ins and continue to address any challenges that arise due to these changes. This will include regular check-ins on



student experience, and the impacts on budget, recruitment, retention, fundraising, staff, and students, and make needed adjustments along the way. Finalize all structures by July 1, 2029.

- **2029 Onwards: Establish a Structure of Continued Institutional Review:** Moving forward, adopt a formal review process of the institution every five years for continued improvement.

## Opportunities for Continued Feedback

As we hone Proposal 3, we also continue to welcome feedback via email. We also welcome invitations for in-person meetings with current programs and/or proposed School clusters here. We will be working with the ASU to again reach out to students to receive feedback. As mentioned above, as we continue to work on the staffing side, we will continue to work with SEIU, AUPAT, and Human Resources. And we will continue to reach out to AUFA to offer opportunities for dialogue and discussion.

We also already have the following sessions booked for further discussion, dialogue, engagement, and input:

- **May 21: Special Meeting of Faculty Council**
- **May 21: Board of Governors Drop-In Question & Answer**
- **May 22: Board of Governors Drop-In Question & Answer**
- **May 23: Acadia Alumni Association Session**
- **May 25: Indigenous Education Advisory Committee Session**
- **May 25: Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) of Senate Meeting**
- **May 27: Special Meeting of Senate**
- **May 29: Academic Planning Committee (APC) of Senate Meeting**
- **June 1: Town & Gown Committee**
- **June 4: Board of Governors Executive Meeting**
- **June 16: June Senate Regular Meeting**
- **June 17-18: Board of Governors Retreat**

## Next Steps

We will continue to work on creating a more detailed staffing plan for the embedded support model, integrating the feedback we have received and clarifying roles and responsibilities.

Finally, the entire proposal will be costed to determine the magnitude of immediate savings and tied in with broader financial and structural planning across the University for Board of Governors decision-making. This will also be shared in detail with the community.



Again, we thank you for your continued commitment, insight, and courage as we shape Acadia's future, together.

---  
**Jeffrey J. Hennessy, PhD**  
President and Vice-Chancellor

---  
**Ashlee Cunsolo, PhD**  
Provost and Vice-President Academic

---  
**Kate Ashley, PhD**  
Vice-Provost Academic Policy &  
Graduate Studies

---  
**Mark Bishop**  
Registrar

---  
**Lauren Wilson Finnis, PhD**  
Vice-Provost Curriculum & Planning

---  
**David Duke, PhD**  
Dean, Faculty of Arts

---  
**Corinne Haigh, PhD**  
Dean, Faculty of Professional Studies

---  
**Jeff Hooper, PhD**  
Dean, Faculty of Pure & Applied  
Sciences

---  
**Jennifer Richard, MLIS**  
Dean, Library & Archives