

Office of the Senate Secretariat

Acadia University  
Wolfville, Nova Scotia  
Canada B0P 1X0

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



21 December 2009

Dear Member of Senate:

I advise you that a meeting of the Senate of Acadia University will occur at **4:00 p.m., Monday, 11 January 2010** in BAC 132. The AGENDA follows:

- 1) Minutes of the Meeting of 14 December 2009
- 2) Announcements and Communications
- 3) Business Arising from the Minutes
  - a) Financial Envelopes Access - Actual Budget Summary - to be presented by M. MacVicar at this meeting ( **910-37-FIN** )
  - b) Academic Program Review Committee - Departmental Responses to the Academic Review Panel reports for Physics, Engineering and Sociology (to be distributed prior to the January meeting) (**910-30-APR**)
- 4) New Business
  - a) Nominating Committee - Vacancy on Senate By-Laws Committee - to be presented at this meeting (**910-38-NOM**)
  - b) Graduate Studies Committee - Proposed Curriculum Changes for ME Program (**910-39-GRD**) \*
- 5) Other Business

Yours sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Rosemary Jotcham  
Registrar and Secretary of Senate

Items Carried Over/Tabled:

Faculty Development Committee - Endowed Chairs (**078-30-FAC**)  
Guidelines for Memoranda of Agreement

Acadia University Senate Graduate Studies Committee 2009-2010  
Form 3: Proposed Modification to existing courses

Department/School: School of Education

Date: November 2009

Brief summary of comments from Department/School meeting:

These modifications were passed unanimously by School Council and Faculty of Professional Studies Council. Modification #1 is simply intended to more clearly alert students to necessary practical considerations of the practicum course. Modification #2 brings the calendar in line with practice: i.e. we currently request that students take the general theories course prior to enrolling in more specific practices courses. In response to a question on modification #4 from FPS Council, the Director assured Council that the regulation would not practically interfere with a student's ability to complete any of the graduate programs in Education, and explained that the regulation addressed an unintended consequence of the precedence clause in the School, whereby without the regulation a student could theoretically take up to half their M.Ed program from one part-time faculty member.

**#1.**

What modification are you requesting?

**Change in calendar description**

Course number, title, calendar description, and prerequisites of the existing course, exactly as they are stated in the most recent University Calendar:

**EDUC 5066 SEMINAR AND PRACTICUM IN COUNSELLING**

This course involves a counselling practicum in an appropriate setting. Placements are chosen in consultation with the instructor. Students are expected to complete 500 hours of intensive supervised practice. The practicum is completed in a block format, normally four days a week for 16 weeks. A seminar accompanies the practicum. Students are responsible for arranging their own practicum in consultation with counselling faculty.

Prereq: EDUC 50F3, 5033, and 5133. Preference is given to those who have completed additional counselling courses

Proposed new course number, title, calendar description (max 60 words), and prerequisites (give both course and grade prerequisites), exactly as you would like them to read in the next University Calendar:

**EDUC 5066 SEMINAR AND PRACTICUM IN COUNSELLING**

This course involves a 500 hour supervised counselling practicum and an accompanying seminar. Students are responsible for arranging their own practicum in consultation with the Practicum Coordinator. The practicum has a residency requirement of 16 weeks. This means that counselling students are expected to take leave of their work situation for that period of time to secure an appropriate practicum experience. Leaves for the practicum are the responsibility of the student and should be considered prior to admission to the Counselling Program.

Prereq: EDUC 50F3, 5033, and 5133. Preference is given to those who have completed

additional counselling courses

Reason for requesting this modification:

Provides more clarity around the student's responsibility for the practicum.

**#2.**

What modification are you requesting?

**Add prerequisite, EDUC 5033 – Theories of Counselling, to the following 4 courses:**

EDUC 50C3 – School Counselling Programs

EDUC 5233 – Counselling Families

EDUC 5553 – Topics in Counselling

EDUC 5593 – Feminist Counselling

Reason for requesting this modification:

A basic understanding of theories of counselling and of foundational skills is necessary to undertake the intellectual and professional work in these areas.

**#3.**

What modification are you requesting?

**Add prerequisites EDUC 5033 – Theories of Counselling and EDUC 5133 – Counselling Skills to the below listed course:**

EDUC 50D3 – Professional Issues in Counselling

Reason for requesting this modification:

Initial exposure to ethics and professionalism provided in these courses establishes a foundation for extensions of these issues in this course.

**#4.**

What modification are you requesting?

**Regulation Change**

Students in a Master of Education program may take a maximum of three (3) courses from the same instructor without permission from the Director, School of Education.

REASON FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGE: The quality and rigour of graduate programs may be called into question when students take more than 30% of their courses from one professor. To provide students with the broadening of knowledge and understanding assumed in graduate education, it is important that they experience a variety of faculty perspectives.

## **Report to Senate**

Sociology Academic Program Review

December 14, 2009

On Behalf of the Academic Program Review Committee

Tom Herman, Chair

---

The Academic Program Review Committee reports the following as a summary of the Academic Program Review of Sociology. The Academic Review Team comprising Dr. Sandra Kirby, Associate Vice-President Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Winnipeg; Dr. Jennie Hornosty, Department of Sociology, University of New Brunswick; Dr. John Eustace, Department of English, Acadia University; and Dr. Tomasz Muldner, Jodrey School of Computer Science, Acadia University, conducted their site visit on February 2-4, 2009. The Team's Summary and Recommendations are provided below. The response of the Sociology Department to the review is also attached. The Academic Program Review Committee met with the Head of the Sociology Department on September 18, 2009 to discuss both the Review document and the Departmental response.

The Academic Program Review Committee wishes to thank the Department of Sociology for their commitment and co-operation during the review process and for their response to the Program Review Committee's recommendations. The APRC will follow up with the Sociology Department at a later date to address the implementation of the review team's recommendations.

### **Summary and Recommendations of Review Team**

The Review Team formulated its recommendations by identifying and addressing the following core questions around new and ongoing developments in the Sociology program at Acadia:

1. *'Is it the right program?'*
2. *'Is it offered in the right form?'*
3. *'Is the learning design right?'*
4. *'Are the right supports in place?'*
5. *'Is the program affordable and are resources effectively deployed?'*
6. *'In addressing these questions, how complete and accurate are the data sources?'*

***1. 'Is it the right program?' Does the program meet the needs of target students? Is it consistent with Acadia's mission and academic plans? Does it accord with Acadia's degree level expectations?***

The Sociology program is definitely consistent with Acadia's mission and strategic plan – relatively small class size, personalized education, collaboration with community, librarian has close relationships with students and faculty (presumably this has been fostered by both sides), close engagement between students and faculty.

While it is desirable to attract more graduate students, the program meets students' needs. Having a one-year MA is good and students commented that it was important in their choice of places to go. There is also some flexibility to accommodate different types of students – e.g. part-time and/or older students.

As outlined in the strategic plan, one of the important Acadia values is excellence in scholarship which includes excellence in teaching and research. Based on students' evaluation of teaching in sociology, the average score for sociology faculty is above 4 on a 5 point scale, certainly one indication of very good teaching.

Excellence in research is indicated in the number of faculty members who have book publications and refereed articles.

Students appear to be well trained and from faculty they receive “personalized attention to students as learners” (Strategic Plan). Students themselves also felt really well-prepared in theory and methods. Moreover, many go on to graduate school or to jobs that utilize their skills.

Faculty members are involved in collaborative, interdisciplinary, and community-based research – all points mentioned in the University’s academic plan.

According to Acadia’s Strategic Plan, one of the five distinguishing features of an Acadia education was an emphasis on “responsible, global citizenship”. Internationalization of the curriculum is one way of doing this. As individual faculty CV’s indicate, over half of the faculty members are involved in research with an international context. The hiring of James Brittain into a tenure track position adds strength to the department’s commitment to ensure that students learn global perspectives.

A number of people made mention of the desire to attract more international students into the graduate program in sociology. However, a significant barrier is the differential fees that international students must pay. The university should continue to explore ways on how to deal with this barrier, especially given the expressed desire to attract more international students.

A number of the sociology faculty will be involved in the new interdisciplinary graduate program in Social and Political Thought – this would increase the number of graduate students in sociology courses.

**2. *‘Is it offered in the right form?’ Does the program structure meet the needs of target students? Are learning units (modules, sessions, courses) scheduled to meet student needs (weekends, intensives, etc)?***

Some students indicated that they would like to see more intersession and/or summer courses that would count towards their sociology requirements. In part, because of flexibility (presumably on the part of both the department and the university) non-traditional students (older, part-time) are accommodated.

There is a need to provide workshops for students on applying for grants and scholarships.

The sequencing of courses in the area of theory and methods seems to work well, although currently the requirements as to methods courses (how many, which ones) are in the process of change. Moreover, the titles of some of the courses appear ‘outdated’, as do certain former areas of strength.

Based on what people said, and given some of the expertise in the department that could make it happen, it would be useful to add a co-operative component to the program.

**3. *‘Is the learning design right?’ Are defined learning needs being addressed effectively? Has consideration been given to more effective and more innovative pedagogies?***

Since we didn’t see a lot of course outlines, it is hard to evaluate whether people are using effective and innovative pedagogies. The theory outlines show interesting pedagogical approaches including having reading posted well in advance of classes, preparation of a documentary, use of original argument on the application of theory, and group presentations. In

the research methods, in the absence of laboratory exposure for students, the methods courses appear to provide some measure of application in the assignments. The graduate course appears as an exacting review of data gathering approaches and analyses. Also, it depends what is meant by effective and innovative. Critical thinking skills are most important and based on what students and faculty said, there is an emphasis on developing these.

Methods of delivery of course material are also affected by class size and physical space. Learning also takes place in informal settings, and the lack of a common departmental space makes it difficult for students and faculty to get together in this way.

Concerns were expressed about grade inflation. The Department appears to be working on a scheme to “standardize” grading and to address the issue. We were told that this problem is not limited to the sociology department.

The Overview indicates that two former areas of strength have been weakened: Aging and gerontology and gender and women’s studies (p. 93). There was a strong sentiment among people (faculty and students) we spoke with that it is imperative that the next replacement be in gender and women’s studies/feminism.

***4. ‘Are the right supports in place?’ Is professional support being provided to faculty and staff to assist in developing more effective learning design, delivery and assessment practices? Are appropriate systems, technologies and related support available?***

There is inadequate funding for research/teaching assistants. This makes the heavy workload for faculty even harder.

Some faculty teach a large number of readings course without any form of compensation.

Professional development funds are limited, which makes travel to more than one conference impossible unless faculty (and students) use their own resources, yet networking at conferences is important for future research and academic stimulation.

Technical support appears good when in the classroom, but some faculty expressed concerns about the difficulty of getting support for one’s office computer.

The excellent Library supports provided to Sociology by Mary MacLeod (Librarian) are tailored to the students’ needs. Students clearly benefit from Ms MacLeod's in-depth understanding of the program and their needs.

***5. ‘Is the program affordable and are resources effectively deployed?’ Are all program costs and revenues identified? Is the program being delivered efficiently? How scalable is the program? Are resourcing decisions consistent with declared plans and priorities?***

By and large the program is delivered efficiently, even though it means a really heavy load for some faculty.

Given the small size of the graduate program, the department should consider combining certain honours and graduate courses, not the core of theory and methods, but rather the elective courses.

The program cannot be scaled down any further though the theory and methods stream, as we have suggested, can be rationalized somewhat.

Resourcing priorities and decisions are decided on democratically. Departmental members debate on what the job ad should say. Student opinions on the candidates brought in for an interview are solicited.

After this current hire in culture and ideology, the next priority is to hire someone in gender and women's issues/ feminism. Nearly everyone we met with agreed that this is a current gap in the department and must be filled – both in terms of areas in the department, but also to contribute to the women's studies program more broadly.

***6. 'In addressing these questions, how complete and accurate are the data sources?' Have students and potential students been consulted? Industry and communities? Is research into effective and innovative pedagogies being utilized?***

We met with all faculty, including those on contractually limited term appointments and those teaching on stipend. The lack of long term planning in terms of course offering makes it very difficult on faculty teaching on stipends who do not know from term to term whether they will have a course to teach, and what the course will be. Something like a three year planning which identified which courses would be offered each year would benefit persons teaching on stipend. The fact that stipend instructors and contract limited term appointments are hired late in the spring means that certain courses are not posted until then, which means that many students will have already chosen their courses for the fall term. A long term planning strategy would not only ensure there were instructors to teach the courses, but it could also improve enrolment figures in these courses.

Faculty members teaching on term contracts year after year, who are active in departmental activities, should have their positions converted to continuing or tenure-stream appointments. This would allow the department to better plan and redistribute its workload.

All students, both undergraduate and graduate, were invited to meet with us. All three graduate students did talk with the committee; also some of the honours students met with us, unfortunately, however, no sociology majors came.

One measure of progress and success is the ability to attract good new faculty, some of whom already have an established research record. This has certainly been accomplished by bringing in an international scholar recently.

The entire full-time faculty and the person on a contractually limited appointment are involved in on-going research. We heard from those outside the department that this is a very vibrant department in terms of research.

A large proportion of honours' students are successful in gaining acceptance to graduate or professional schools. – six out of 10 for 2007; eight in 2008 – but the total number of honours students that year is not available.

A challenge for the department is that enrolments in Sociology at both the undergraduate and graduate levels are declining (although enrolment at the graduate level seems to fluctuate a lot) - this pattern seems consistent with what is happening in the university as a whole.

**Department of Sociology's Response to the Review**

**20 September, 2009**

The Department of Sociology welcomed the review of our programmes. We were concerned with the length of time that it took between our Internal Review documents being produced (1

June 2008) and the actual Review occurring. We were dismayed at the time it took between the actual Review and the reviewers' Report. Below we systematically respond to key points in the Report, beginning with consideration of The Full Review (beginning on page 7 of the document).

- P7 Materials Received #10. All course outlines were available to reviewers on request. The reviewers asked to have only those listed, but later commented, at times incorrectly, on other courses whose outlines were available for them to check.
- P9 Para 1: The point about only 3 faculty (2007-08) and 6 (2008-09) having full teaching loads is factually incorrect. Every one of us carries a full load (3-2) of classes, with the only exceptions being contractually agreed to: 1<sup>st</sup> year tenure stream faculty (2-2); Head (2-1) and, for 2009-10, the Women's Studies Co-ordinator (2-1). This major factual error (which provides the basis for later factually incorrect comments by the reviewers) probably occurs because the reviewers neglected our significant teaching loads in IDST and our 2 assigned graduate courses (Theory and Methods) which were supplied to them in our list of courses. In addition, we do carry unremunerated overloads in all other grad courses, Honours and MA thesis advising and reading courses. Back in the era of 3-3, over five years ago, we did have a mechanism by which the accumulation of unremunerated honours and MA advising and course work would lead to a 3hr. credit course reduction. We have not used any such mechanism since collective bargaining achieved a 3-2 normal teaching load.
- P9 Para 3: After a thorough review, a new set of requirements in Methods was implemented last year (2008-09). We appreciate that "we are well known in the region for its strength in social theory, critical Marxism and political economy".
- P9 Para 4: We appreciate how positively we are seen to support Acadia and our Dept.'s core values. We agree that we do have an open door policy for students and appreciate their expressed praise. We note that the recent external review for the new MA programme in Social and Political Thought also noted our key research and teaching contributions in political economy in particular.
- P9 Para 5: Our department's reliance on contract faculty is directly related to our not being allowed, so far, to restore our complement of 10 full-time positions. We look forward to that being remedied. The list of courses in the last sentence appear to be arbitrarily chosen and does not reflect the depth and breadth of courses chosen. We agree that there is "gender balance" among the faculty. We note that since our next hiring for a full-time position requires someone to work in Women's and Gender Studies. The incumbent is highly likely to be female.
- P9 Para 6: We agree with the praise for our administrative assistant and agree that she does work overtime without adequate remuneration and have taken steps to alleviate it (see below).
- P10 Para 1: By the time the Review occurred, Mervyn Horgan had been offered a tenure-stream Lecturer position. We have two Professors Emeritae (Looker and Auger) who do not appear in the list of faculty.
- P10 Para 3: We appreciate the work and the "clear commitment to Acadia" of our current CLT and per-course faculty.
- P10 Para 4: The discussion of FCEs fails to note that our decline in FCEs is no worse than in the rest of Arts and indeed other Faculties and that our FCE load in any year has remained above average compared to all departments in Arts as well as to all medium and 'large' departments.
- P11 Para 1: We agree that we have a very solid set of Theory and Methods courses offered at all levels of study.
- P11 Para 2: We agree that we do contribute strongly to interdisciplinary courses and programmes. We also contribute strongly to interdisciplinary research.
- P11 Para 3: We don't understand the meaning of "some concern" over losing double-majors to Honours. We are 'mighty proud' of our excellent record in attracting and



advising Honours students. Enrolments in all our various programmes are up this year (2009-10) and in 2008-09 we had the largest increase in Arts (one of the very few to have any increase last year).

- P11 Para 4: We urge, not require, students to keep the Honours thesis to 50 pages; most are between 60 and 70 pages.
- P11 Para 5: This paragraph confuses summer fellowships (of which we receive 1 or 2 a year) with regular session TAs. Cutbacks to the departmental budget have meant we now can offer TAs to less than ½ of the Honours students compared to previous years during the regular session. There is a clear set of duties for TAs outlined in our Honours Handbook.
- P11 Para 6: Over the last 5 years we have grown from the 3<sup>rd</sup> largest grad programme in Arts to the largest.
- P11 Para 7: As noted in our response to P. 9 Para 1, the “points accumulation system” was dropped five years ago. We review this decision annually and have recently decided not to reintroduce it at this time.
- P11 Para 8: We agree that there is a broad diversity of approaches, that we have been, in the main, “quite cohesive”, and that there has been, in the main, “creative tension” (as opposed to the endless factionalism that characterises many other departments, especially other Sociology departments).
- P12 Para 4: The Head now does all academic advising. The Office Manager sets up these appointments and inputs, in the main, the technical changes required.
- P12 Para 6: We appreciate the strong recognition of the Department’s faculty. We intend to continue being “vibrant”, collegial and highly linked to communities. We continue to find ways to ensure and enhance what the reviewers see as our “culture of respect”.
- P13 Para 3: Our enrolments are back to our normally high levels. We have (and always have had) many more courses with over 40 students than (remunerated) courses under 10. Last year’s enrolment expressed the general situation at Acadia of low enrolments, but was exacerbated by the late hirings and, therefore, late listings; nevertheless our enrolment last year declined less than the University as a whole.
- P13 Para 4: We note that 4133 and 4143 have not been taught recently and that 5123 and 5133 are graduate courses that are not available to undergrads.
- P13 Para 5: Yes we are proud of our extensive and intensive work with Honours students.
- P13 Para 6: This paragraph is factually incorrect. 4133 has never been a core course.
- P14 Para 1 and 2: We deeply appreciate the praise for our graduate programme. And we continue to make the grad programme even better.
- P14 Para 3-7: We appreciate the very high praise of our teaching and research. We note, in general the very low acceptance rate for SSHRCC grants, especially in our region, that one member (Thomson) does participate in a major SSHRCC grant centred at Dalhousie University, and another (Horgan) recently turned down an SSHRCC post-doc in order to take up a tenure stream position here. We do wonder what “comparatively” means in “comparatively large commitment of faculty to both theory and methods.
- P15 Para 1 and 2: We appreciate the praise for both our administrative assistant and for the rest of our unit infrastructure and administration.
- P15 Para 3: The Department has hired in the field of “culture and ideology” and is currently attempting to hire in “feminist, gender and women’s studies”.
- P15 Para 4: The Department has 3 of nine full-time faculty who are Marxist (2 senior, 1 junior) and 1 CLT who is a Marxist-Feminist. Three of our last four tenure-stream hires have been of non-Marxists. The most shared perspective in our Department is feminism. Indeed, a solid proportion of excellent Honours students choose to work in a broad range of topics using a Marxist and/or feminist approach. Marxist analysis continues to be a major attraction for students pursuing a Masters degree at Acadia in our Department. The main point, however, is that, as is clear in our Honours and Masters listings, the

Department also has a large number of other research and teaching strengths. We challenge the validity of any suggestion that we are unbalanced (recall that our balance is recognised in other parts of the Review). We are committed to and have worked hard to achieve excellence AND balance/diversity (a balance/diversity that is, in fact, recognised throughout much of the rest of the Review).

- P15 Para 5: This paragraph, concerning the views of the four full-time faculty who the Review identified as junior, came as a complete surprise to the ‘senior’ faculty, and ‘junior’ faculty said that it did not reflect their experience. Our Department is proud of its reputation for fighting for equality and equity; the Department as a whole is committed to identifying and collectively resolving any such complaints concerning inequities. With respect to “the lack of (or limited) mentoring”, the Head (both current and former) has always mentored the junior faculty in terms of what it takes to retain the job and be promoted. On the face of it, that mentorship has only led to success (including one person being promoted early). Three of the four junior faculty have in fact written strong expressions of thanks to the Head for his mentoring support. With respect to being overworked, both senior and junior faculty often work hard. All of us do unremunerated work (thesis advising, second readers, Honours and grad reading courses etc). In any given year there is, of course, variation in the amount of unpaid work each of us do (last year, for instance one of the junior faculty successfully advised 2 out of 3 of the most recent grad cohort). There is also a set of faculty (both senior and junior) who do more than average. Within all this variation there is no evidence that juniors “take on a disproportionately high supervisory load”, as a whole. In terms of regular workload, the mean FCE load of juniors is consistently below the mean FCE load of seniors. NO faculty are required to do any of the unremunerated work; it is entirely voluntary and often sought out. For most of us, senior and junior, it is one of the major ways that the job is exciting. The Head will seek to ensure that each of our monthly meetings will have an agenda item on Equality and Equity in the Department.
- P15 last Para: Long-term planning for part-timers is impractical because most allocations are last minute.
- P16 Para 1-4: Again these are mainly institutional problems. From now on, the approved Minutes of our meetings will be sent to part-timers, both current and on our roster. The problem with finding replacements for the Head appears to be universal but should not be overstated (4 of our current 6 senior faculty have served as Head).
- P16 Para 6: We view the “lack of standardization of course content” (other than teaching a content relevant to the course description!) as a strength, not a weakness. There is absolutely NO “ownership” of particular courses. In our shared view, standardization often produces standard ways of thinking, not creative and critical thought. The Department remains proud of its commitment to diverse approaches to social analysis.
- P16 Para 7: We are unaware of any course ever being denied anybody who wants (and is qualified) to teach any of our courses. Much more than other departments at Acadia and elsewhere in Sociology, the opportunity to teach 4<sup>th</sup> year and grad courses (including core courses) has been made available to all full-time faculty. For instance, all junior faculty except the most junior, have been given the opportunity to teach remunerated 4<sup>th</sup> year and/or grad courses.
- P16 Para 8: We will discuss the implementation of a capstone course for 4<sup>th</sup> year majors.
- P16 Para 9: We are currently reviewing ALL of our course offerings and descriptions, and all of our areas of strength at both the grad and undergrad levels, including prerequisites.
- P17 Para 2: Again, we do not require a maximum thesis length but only suggest. We note that the average published journal article in Sociology is between 32 and 40 double-spaced pages.
- P17 Para 3: This sentence should refer, we think, to our Senior Seminar 4003.

- P17 Para 4-6: The departmental Honours Handbook has clear deadlines and affirms that any dispute between advisor and professor in the Senior Seminar is resolved in favour of the supervisor. The departmental Graduate Handbook has the same.
- P17 Para 7: Last year, SOCI 5123 had 2 Political Science grads enrolled and this interdisciplinary trend will probably continue. The Grad Theory Course will be a core course in the new interdisciplinary MA in Social and Political Thought.
- P17 Para 8 and 9: Basically, the lack of Graduate Funding is an institutional deficit that needs to be seriously confronted.
- P18 Para 1-5: There is a big difference between interest in applying for a SSHRCC grant and extremely low likelihood of success in receiving a grant that is common to small universities, especially in Atlantic Canada. It is incorrect, in general, to say that a lot of sociological research requires only low funding. More internal funding is certainly needed. The Department would willingly compare its publication record with any university, large or small, in Atlantic Canada.
- P18 Para 6: We need, like History, English and Poli Sci, a designated lounge space.
- P19 Para 1: We will resolve the Headship issue internally.

## SECTION 5 **Recommendations**

### 5.1 For Faculty

- A 3-year plan for stability for contract faculty seems unlikely but might be a good idea.
- We completely agree that at long last we should return to our historic complement of 10 and are working to achieve that.
- We agree that our social anthropology component needs a new position.
- As mentioned, we are currently reviewing all of our areas of strength, course offerings and course descriptions.
- We will continue to work with Research and Grad Studies to mentor anyone concerning grant applications.

### 5.2 For Undergraduate Programs

- We will continue to clarify our Theory and Methods offerings.
- We are against integrating our Honours and Grad course offerings. We see them as 2 different peer groups, each of which requires special attention.
- We do teach SPSS and a wide array of other packages. Computer Labs are not necessary at Acadia as every student has access to these programmes on their computer.
- We do not currently offer certificates.
- We do offer co-operative placements. They are not heavily utilised.

### 5.3 For Honours and Graduate Programs

- We will relook at the issue of integrating the Honours and Grad Seminars. One problem is that for about half of our grad students it would be repetitive. We will continue to discuss how to lessen our unremunerated work with Honours and grad students.
- Again, our linkages to other programs (IDST, WGS, Social and Political Thought) are already very strong.
- Again, we do need more AGAs, but, also we do have currently the largest grad program in Arts.
- Workshops for applying to grad schools etc. are a very good idea. One such workshop was conducted in 2008-09, was well-attended and positively responded to by students. We plan to expand on this in coming years.

### 5.4 For Teaching and Research Opportunities

- We agree with this entire section!

### 5.5

- We basically agree with this whole section also, EXCEPT to point out that the administrative assistant is not now responsible for advising (the Head is).

Note: Our responses to the first few pages of the document should be evident from the above. The Department will work out a thorough Action Plan after the Head consults with the Dean of Arts and APRC.

## **Report to Senate**

Engineering Academic Program Review

December 14, 2009

On Behalf of the Academic Program Review Committee

Tom Herman, Chair

---

The Academic Program Review Committee reports the following as a summary of the Academic Program Review of the Ivan Curry School of Engineering. The Academic Review Team comprising Terry W. Hennigar, P.Eng., FCSCE, FEC, Water Consulting, Wolfville; Don Gillis, P.Eng., Emeritus Professor of Engineering, University of PEI; Dr. Richard Karsten, Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Acadia University; and Dr. John Roscoe, P.Chem., FCIC, Emeritus Professor, Department of Chemistry, Acadia University, conducted their site visit on March 30 - 31, 2009. The Team's Summary and Recommendations are provided below. The response of the School of Engineering to the review is also attached. The Academic Program Review Committee met with the Director of the School of Engineering on September 18, 2009 to discuss both the Review document and the School's response.

The Academic Program Review Committee wishes to thank the School of Engineering for their commitment and co-operation during the review process and for their response to the Program Review Committee's recommendations. The APRC will follow up with the School of Engineering at a later date to address the implementation of the review team's recommendations.

### **Summary and Recommendations of Review Team**

#### **SUMMARY -**

1. The School of Engineering at Acadia has not been recognized on campus for its value and potential to providing a strong and critical education to students who go on from here to complete graduate work at other universities and contribute to major engineering projects on local, national, and international stages.
2. The questionable handling of the Foulis endowment fund is an example of how the school of engineering has been neglected in the overall management of university affairs.
3. Faculty and staff are very well qualified, competent, and committed professionally to providing an education in Engineering at Acadia. All are totally committed time wise to teaching, research, and counseling students.
4. Extension of the academic programs in Engineering at Acadia to three or four years would make it possible for Engineering students to benefit from the collaborative research experience with other academic units at Acadia and with faculty members at Dalhousie.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS -**

1. The Foulis Chair in Engineering must be given top priority and filled as soon as absolutely possible. This position will provide a strong link between, and enhance research opportunities with engineering and other academic units such as, physics, computer science, math, and earth and environmental science.
2. A position is needed on faculty to provide relief to existing staff for sabbatical, research, and administration including promotion and raising awareness of the profession of Engineering.
3. More emphasis on the three year program with the possible development of a four year degree program is recommended to provide engineering students greater opportunities for research and collaborative studies with other schools such as computer science, physics, mathematics, and earth science and environmental science.
4. The University should address the deferred maintenance issues that have led to the poor quality of existing research space in Carnegie Hall.

5. In concert with the statement in the Strategic Plan the University should identify research space that would permit faculty members in the School to adequately build research programs that would make them more competitive in obtaining external research funds.
6. The University should provide new targeted funds, based on academic excellence in Engineering and related disciplines, to support the research of undergraduate Engineering students under the supervision of Engineering faculty members.
7. The university should continue to provide budgetary support to maintain the Interdepartmental Workshop facility as a key component of the Engineering education at Acadia.
8. The University should continue to provide an office for the IRAP representative in Carnegie Hall as an important resource for both undergraduate teaching and research activities of the School.
9. The University should maintain at least its current level of support for access to the Engineering literature via the resources managed by the Vaughan Memorial Library.
10. The University should give priority to extending the engineering education program to three or four years to enhance the engineering training and research opportunities while at Acadia.

### **School of Engineering's Response to Recommendations from the Review** November 5, 2009

#### **General**

The School of Engineering has received and considered the report of the external reviewers and welcomes this opportunity to provide feedback to the APRC. We are generally pleased with the content of the report.

The reviewers felt that Engineering at Acadia deserved a much higher profile on campus than it currently enjoys, and identified the establishment of the Foulis Chair in Engineering as a high priority. We naturally agree with these observations. They spoke well of the School's existing programs, academic standards and faculty. Especially positive comments were made concerning the enthusiasm of the staff for teaching and the overall experience of students as they move through the program. Some thoughtful comments were made concerning the difficulties of carrying out undergraduate research within the current two year program, and concrete suggestions were made for measures that might improve the situation. Finally, the reviewers stated that it is time for the school to consider a move to a program of longer duration, something that agrees well with our own strategic plan.

Many of the positive findings are consistent with the results of other reviews and accreditations over the years (CEAB 1995, 2001, 2006 and the NSCHE system-wide review of 1998). All of these complemented the School on its academic standards, commitment to teaching and student experience in a manner similar to the current review. All also suggested that Acadia had the capacity to possibly expand its engineering programs.

We very strongly agree with the statement made by Mr. Hennigar (the chair of the review committee) in his covering letter, i.e.

*“The two most important conclusions and recommendations from this review relate to (1) the questionable handling of the Foulis endowment fund which was given to Acadia for the benefit of Engineering studies here rather than at Dalhousie and (2) Extension of the academic programs in Engineering at Acadia to three or four years...”*

Each of these deserves a bit of discussion. The Foulis chair is seen (at least within our unit) as the key to the long term future of the school. Certainly the establishment of a chair would help satisfy some of the recommendations made later in the report, i.e. It would give engineering a higher profile at Acadia, and play a role in any possible expansion of our programs. While the report does not explicitly link the establishment of the chair to the planning priorities within the school, the review committee does state that the school “should remain the prime beneficiary of

the chair and have significant input in its establishment” (p15). We take this to mean that the priorities of the School will at least have to be considered in the process used to set up and fill a chair position. We were very pleased to see this statement in the review report and definitely hope that this will be the model used to guide future planning for the chair.

The review committee accurately described the frustration of the faculty with the long drawn out process (nine years!) followed to establish a chair so far. There is a very real sense within the school that this reflects an underlying lack of commitment on the part of the university to its engineering program, and that, despite assurances to the contrary, Acadia really has no intention of ever allowing engineering to benefit from its generous gift. There is also a suspicion that if the university were forced to create a chair that it would use every available avenue to ensure that would be at the lowest salary level possible and set up in such a way as to maximize the benefits to units outside of Engineering instead of within the school. The clear statement from the review committee regarding chair priorities was welcome, but endorsement of same by Senate would be even more useful to us. We hope and expect that the APRC includes a statement on this issue in its final report.

With regard to the expansion of programs, at least three concrete proposals for full degree programs have been put forward over the last ten years (Engineering and Management, Engineering Physics and Mechatronics Engineering). These proposals took significant effort and time to prepare. They were requested by the administration as part of the planning process to establish Foulis chair or chairs, and each assumed that new resources would be available to the school through the endowment. Those resources were ultimately denied each time, causing the demise of the associated curriculum proposal. It does not seem possible to contemplate the expansion of our current programs to 4 year, accredited degree status without the provision of new resources. Should the APRC wish to endorse the creation of a 4 year degree program, it would thus seem appropriate to include a statement to the effect that new resources would be required and possibly comment on the source of same. The Foulis endowment would seem to be the most likely source.

However, this brings up a problem. Previous commitments from the endowment, whether in support of curriculum proposals or not, have always been fuzzy and vague. The actual dollar value available was never disclosed to us in advance and the commitment of any money at all was always to be dependent on the strength of the proposal. The second condition seems reasonable, but the first is simply not rational. No serious planning exercise can take place without knowing what is actually possible and what is not. This is especially frustrating, because such figures should be readily available. The endowment is, after all, dedicated to a specific purpose and one would expect that the capital would be invested accordingly, i.e. to provide the stable salary for the chair that Mr. Foulis envisaged.

We have heard time and again statements to the effect that the monies available are subject to the short term fluctuations of the market, and thus cannot be guaranteed. Such an investment strategy is definitely not in keeping with the purpose of the endowment, as, taken literally, it means that no one could ever be hired to a permanent position, as their salary could not be guaranteed. We therefore see the development of a long-term management plan for the endowment monies, designed to provide a stable pay-out in the form of a salary, as an essential first step towards filling a chair position and/or moving to expanding our current program offerings.

### **Detailed Review of Recommendations**

Although we agree with most of the reviewer’s recommendations, there were some minor issues with language and content that we would like to comment on. The following comments reflect the views of the School, arrived at through discussion at a departmental meeting. Each recommendation will be discussed separately.

**1. “The Foulis Chair in Engineering must be given top priority and filled as soon as absolutely possible. This position will provide a strong link between, and enhance research opportunities with engineering and other academic units such as, physics, computer science, math and earth and environmental science.”**

The unit absolutely agrees with the first sentence of this recommendation, i.e. that the Foulis Chair should be filled as soon as possible. The second sentence is seen as slightly problematic. It seems to narrow the potential focus areas of the chair unnecessarily. We would suggest that replacing the word “will” with “could” would alleviate many of our concerns.

The rationale for this suggestion is simple. As it stands, the recommendation would eliminate all prospect of filling the position with anything other than an inter-disciplinary, science orientated researcher. We feel that the possibility should exist to hire a distinguished person with interests in other areas, should those be deemed to be of more importance to the future plans of the School of Engineering. Engineering Ethics or the role of Engineering in Society are only two of the areas that come immediately to mind as possibilities here.

**2. A position is needed on faculty to provide relief to existing staff for sabbatical, research, and administration including promotion and raising awareness of the profession of Engineering.**

It was agreed that this should be tied to the 1<sup>st</sup> recommendation, in that a Foulis Chair could fill both of these roles. Note however that the “promotion and raising awareness of the Profession of Engineering” function might best be carried out by a chair with expertise outside of the areas suggested in recommendation #1.

**3. More emphasis on the three year program with the possible development of a four year degree program is recommended to provide engineering students greater opportunities for research and collaborative studies with other schools such as computer science, physics, mathematics, and earth science and environmental science.**

It was agreed that our response to this recommendation should be separated into 2 sections. It was also noted that recommendations 3 and 10 are similar.

Section 1: We agree with the recommendation to emphasize our three year programs more, but would resist the temptation to do this by simply dropping the two year program. We would instead suggest that we switch to marketing them as “regular” and “accelerated” programs. The BASc could be redesigned to consist of three years of ten single term courses each (thus bringing it in line with university norms for undergraduate programs), while the minimum requirement for the CAS would remain at 22 courses. All students entering the school would initially be admitted to a combined BASc/CAS program. After completing a common first year of 10 courses, students would opt to either follow the standard program of two more years of study, or enter the “accelerated” CAS, which would require that they take 12 courses in their second year. Admission to the two year accelerated program could be restricted to those with superior grades at the end of year one, thus ensuring a reasonable expectation of success in the more demanding schedule.

Another requirement for admission to the accelerated program could be the granting of conditional acceptance into the discipline-specific department at Dal. This, combined with possibly setting up a default 3-year program to accommodate a number of engineering disciplines could make dealing with the cumbersome admission procedures forced on us by Dal slightly less onerous. In this system, students not obtaining a placement at the end of the first year would have an extra year to make up their average and every Acadia graduate following the standard program would be prepared to enter a range of discipline-specific departments at Dal.

Section 2: While a desirable goal, it is not immediately clear to us how we could structure an undergraduate engineering program to provide “greater opportunities for research and

collaborative studies with other schools such as computer science, physics, mathematics, and earth science and environmental science”. Possibly some of the envisaged collaboration could occur by incorporating more project work in the curriculum than is presently the case, but our experience has been that not a lot of inter-departmental collaboration occurs in the existing project courses we offer and we don’t expect that this would change with an expanded curriculum. It was therefore felt that perhaps the 3<sup>rd</sup> recommendation should end at “research and collaborative studies”.

**4. The University should address the deferred maintenance issues that have led to the poor quality of existing research space in Carnegie Hall.**

All agree that it would be good to see an upgrade of facilities. The major problem is in the basement of the building, where moisture problems have developed. There is plaster falling, mismatched paint, tiles lifting off of the floor and issues with spider webs. The fluids lab feels like a utility room turned into a lab and not up to the standard that students expect.

We feel that we should be next in line for major renovations within Science. The facilities for Engineering simply do not match the standard of other departments on campus, and this has an effect on student recruitment. We do, however, have enough space – the Labs are somewhat ugly, but certainly workable.

**5. In concert with the statement in Strategic Plan the University should identify research space that would permit faculty members in the School to adequately build research programs that would make them more competitive in obtaining external research funds.**

This recommendation was somewhat unexpected. Currently, 3 out of the four faculty members in the unit are allotted secure space deemed adequate for their needs, while the fourth has been allotted a portion of a public lab space. The member with the non-secure work space has been unable to obtain funding for his research from the major funding councils. All agree that it would be nice to be able to accommodate every request for space, regardless of external support, but feel that this would be extremely difficult to do. This is not felt to be simply an “engineering” problem, but rather a campus wide issue.

As the Faculty member in question has not formally requested more space from either the Director of the School or the Dean of the faculty, the recommendation probably arose out of on-site interviews conducted by the committee during their visit here. The director of the school has since advised the person involved to approach the Dean of Science for space, as there is simply no area in Carnegie that could be converted for his exclusive use. This issue may take on added significance once a Foulis Chair is appointed.

**6. The University should provide new targeted funds, based on academic excellence in Engineering and related disciplines, to support the research of undergraduate Engineering students under the supervision of Engineering faculty members.**

Currently, much of the funding on campus for undergraduate research is not accessible to engineering students. Most is (quite understandably) targeted at honours students, or at least students in their final years of study in four year degrees. Our brightest students, for the most part, leave the university after two years of study. We are also shut out of some internal competitions such as the NSERC USRA program, even though some Engineering faculty hold grants and are otherwise eligible to participate. We endorse student research funding in all of its forms, and are really seeking equal access to funding available to students in other disciplines.

**7. The university should continue to provide budgetary support to maintain the Interdepartmental Workshop facility as a key component of the Engineering education at Acadia.**

There should be a stipend position for a shop supervisor, and this should be an ongoing part of either the faculty or departmental budget.



**8. The University should continue to provide an office for the IRAP representative in Carnegie Hall as an important resource for both undergraduate teaching and research activities of the School.**

All agree that the current rental agreement with the NRC is a good one and should continue. Having Gary Bustin on-site is a great asset to the Engineering department. He provides an excellent industrial liaison for the school and his expertise also helps students close the gap between theory and practice.

**9. The University should maintain at least its current level of support for access to the Engineering literature via the resources managed by the Vaughan Memorial Library.**

We would like to see the current budget maintained, but hope that the library resources could be used in ways that would have a higher impact on students and faculty. Engineering students make limited use of the physical library, and do not make sufficient use of electronic resources. It is also felt that the periodicals are currently not maintained in a way that makes them usable by students. One suggestion we have for improvement might be to create an access point in our building that would provide regularly updated lists of new materials and remind the students of what is actually available to them campus-wide. Another thought is that monetary resources currently used for book acquisition might be better put into online materials, given our students current minimal use of existing stacks.

Finally, we very much appreciate the in-course support we receive from our librarians, and hope to expand on that interaction through more “research methods” sessions in our courses. Possibly more personal interaction of this sort would encourage our students to use the available resources more.

**10. The University should give priority to extending the engineering education program to three or four years to enhance the engineering training and research opportunities while at Acadia.**

This was addressed in the third recommendation.

## **Report to Senate**

Nutrition and Dietetics Academic Program Review

December 14, 2009

On Behalf of the Academic Program Review Committee

Tom Herman, Chair

---

The Academic Program Review Committee reports the following as a summary of the Academic Program Review of the School of Nutrition and Dietetics. The Academic Review Team comprising Dr. Susan Evers, University of Guelph, Prof. Linda Lusby, Acadia University, Dr. Judy Paisley, Ryerson University, and Dr. Marlene Snyder, Acadia University, conducted their site visit on September 22-24, 2008. Concurrently, an accreditation review was carried out by Dietitians of Canada. The Team's Summary and Recommendations are provided below. The response of the School of Nutrition and Dietetics to the review is also attached. The Academic Program Review Committee met with the Director of the School of Nutrition and Dietetics on September 18, 2009 to discuss both the Review document and the School's response.

The Academic Program Review Committee wishes to thank the School of Nutrition and Dietetics for their commitment and co-operation during the review process and for their response to the Program Review Committee's recommendations. The APRC will follow up with the School at a later date to address the implementation of the review team's recommendations.

### **Summary and Recommendations of Review Team**

The Review Team organized the framework of their report around the eight strategic planning themes identified in Acadia's *Strategic Plan*, arriving at the following summary and recommendations:

The BSN program offered by the School of Nutrition and Dietetics is of high quality with a strong national reputation. There are two main areas of concern: the lack of flexibility in the program of study and the high turnover of faculty in recent years. We have offered suggestions intended to address these concerns while maintaining the quality of the program.

1. Modify the curriculum. This may provide:
  - a. More flexibility for students and faculty through the deletion/revision of courses;
  - b. Opportunities for students to explore other career options through the provision of more electives;
  - c. Opportunities to address faculty workload issues and support the development of research agendas.
2. Provide dedicated human resources to expand the IDI [Integrated Dietetic Internship] to meet the needs of many more students and consider rescheduling the IDI to form a 5<sup>th</sup> year of the program.
3. Hire faculty to fill vacant positions. An external search for the Director of the School has been approved. In addition, tenure-stream replacements for the two most recent resignations in the area of food science are essential if the School is to be able to continue to offer its programs.
4. Increase the number of students in the honours program. Promotion of the honours program will give students a way to explore their interests in practice-based research or graduate study, and will provide faculty members with a means of moving forward their research agendas.
5. Provide increased support for faculty to help establish their research program, including a formal mentoring program for new/junior faculty, improved University support, and participation in the new MSc program offered through Recreational Management and Kinesiology.
6. Schedule a faculty retreat to seek consensus on changes to the curriculum and to engage in team building.

7. Enhance language services for international students to improve their English language communication skills.

## **Response by the School of Nutrition and Dietetics to Recommendations from the Review March, 2009**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The School of Nutrition and Dietetics (SND) is engaged in three reviews during the 2008 - 2009 academic year. These include the Senate Program Review and the Dietitians of Canada (DC) Accreditation Review, which were completed concurrently in the fall of 2008-09. Subsequently, the faculty, staff and student representatives of the School of Nutrition and Dietetics have been engaged in analysis of both of those reports. The third DC review, which focuses on our Integrated Dietetic Internship (IDI) program, will be completed in March 2009 by a second team of Dietitians of Canada reviewers. Until the third review is completed, our responses must be considered preliminary, however there are substantive parts of the first two reports which we feel are unlikely to be affected by the third review thus we have responded to those recommendations.

The School is very appreciative of the work done by the reviewers. Their thorough reports have provided thoughtful, comprehensive guidance which has been the basis for significant and well supported changes in the curriculum and in the overall functioning of the School.

While the two reports serve different purposes, many of the same recommendations are repeated in both documents, thus we have chosen to use the recommendations and commentary from the Senate Program Review Report to guide our initial response; when the DC Accreditation Review report differs substantially or includes recommendations that were not in the Senate Program Review report, those recommendations will be dealt with specifically in a final section at the end of this document.

### **SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

SND Summary Response to Recommendation #1: The SND supports these objectives and notes the following:

Increased program flexibility for students has been achieved by deleting/revising four required courses, resulting in a less prescriptive curriculum. The four "openings" in student's schedules will be filled with new electives. Nutr lab hours will be more flexible. This will reduce lab contact hours for both faculty and students.

In the past, there were very few electives offered except for those required to complete the Dietetics option (in essence these had become "requirements" for most students). The SND has created a new course (approved by Senate) Nutr 4913 Special Topics which allows faculty with a particular expertise to create and pilot new courses in areas not previously possible. Beginning next year, and continuing over time, each member of faculty will design two new electives, to expose students to new areas of interest in nutrition and dietetics, including but not limited to Global Perspectives in Nutrition, Obesity, Media, Nutrition Consulting and Counselling, and Sports Nutrition.

The new electives will offer opportunities to explore diverse career options beyond dietetics; additionally the new courses will expose students to areas about which faculty are passionate and very knowledgeable, leading some students to explore their interests in research and honours study - potentially leading to graduate school, or nutrition careers other than dietetics.

The new courses will also serve faculty members' needs to teach some courses about which they are passionate. And equally important, if properly scheduled in second and third year, some of these may serve to recruit honours students, or provide advanced study in some key aspects of

nutrition in third and fourth year courses. The overall objective is to create individual career niches which blend teaching and research activities together; the niche electives are one step along that path and should serve to increase student involvement in research and education collaborations with faculty members.

The SND is committed to developing strategies to increase student knowledge about nondietetic career options, internships, co-ops and graduate school opportunities and will include these topics in faculty-student advising sessions, course content, department displays and so forth.

#### SND Summary Response to Recommendation #2:

The assignment of a person(s) responsible for collaboration with Dietitians of Canada and the placement of students in post-graduate dietetic internships and integrated dietetic internships has shifted too frequently in recent times between CLT, tenure-track, or tenured faculty. Additionally these time-consuming activities should not be assigned to professors, given their need to balance research, teaching and service. These are very important support services that we provide to students and the placements should be done to the best of our ability, which means that all qualified students should be placed if possible. Third year students have not completed two years of course work and lack the essential qualifications for professional dietetic placements.

Thus the SND will:

Assign the duties of DC liaison and IDI placements to our senior Instructor who has the knowledge, experience, contacts and resources to perform these duties well. Move the IDI placement to 5th year. Students will register for a 5th year at Acadia University. The SWD will work collaboratively with all qualified students to access IDI placements.

#### SND Summary Response to Recommendation #3:

The search for a new Director is underway. Applications are currently being examined. The search for an Instructor has been approved and is proceeding. Plans have been approved to mentor a current CLT faculty member through the process of completing a Ph.D.

#### SND Summary Response to Recommendation #4:

The school is committed to diversifying student experiences and career options. The reviewers noted that too much emphasis was placed on dietetics and that a more balanced emphasis was needed; a campaign has been started to expose students to food, nutrition and honours as viable, important program and career options. For example, the new elective courses in second year will be ideally timed for recruiting honours students.

#### SND Summary Response to Recommendation #5:

There is widespread support for a significant shift toward creating niche teaching research careers for faculty. This will be accomplished by reducing faculty contact time in non-essential teaching and service activities, putting in place plans to integrate teaching and research efforts (i.e. well timed Special Topics electives) for each faculty member which expose students to faculty, and recruitment of a new Director whose leadership style and philosophy are aligned to the importance of this initiative. The new Director will foster a research culture by mentoring faculty, emphasizing career niches, and research collaborations, and will ensure that supports and funding for research available on campus (i.e. through Research and Graduate Studies, etc.) are available to faculty.

#### SND Summary Response to Recommendation #6:

These review reports have already generated considerable strategic thought about the potential for shifting to a new culture. It is vital that the new Director be capable of leading this shift further. Team building will be a vital part of that journey. Retreats and regular Council meetings

which include all SND members in open discussion must be a regular part of that process. An effective new Director is essential to engage faculty.

SND Summary Response to Recommendation #7:

ESL students are facing language challenges in the program. This appears to be part of a University-wide need and is not within the ability of the SND to change. That said, we agree that more needs to be done to screen before admission and support these students once admitted.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

The School of Nutrition and Dietetics wishes to thank the review team for their work on our behalf. Their reports have become a significant catalyst for changes that will allow the School to transform itself to the benefit of students, faculty and staff. The School is supportive of all the thoughts expressed in the two reports and is already in the process of implementing many of the changes. A small number of recommended changes in curriculum may not be changed due to university regulations or degree requirements, but these are few in number and minor. Some changes will take longer, but the foundational objectives are now in place to guide that process. The School is optimistic that with a new Director and a more stable complement, we are well positioned to engage in new planning directions.