



Dear Member of Senate:

I advise you that a meeting of the Senate of Acadia University will occur at 4:00 pm on Monday, 10 September 2012 in BAC 132.

The agenda follows:

- 1) Approval of Agenda
- 2) Minutes of the Meeting of 18 June 2012
- 3) Announcements
- 4) Brought forward from 9 May 2012
  - a) Senate Committee Annual Reports - Vote on motion to receive pending:
    - i. Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning (2011-2012)
    - ii. Committee on Graduate Studies (2011-2012)
    - iii. Research Committee (2011-2012)
    - iv. Honours Committee (2011-2012)
    - v. Research Ethics Board (2011-2012)
    - vi. Library Committee (2011-2012)
    - vii. Executive Committee (2011-2012)
    - viii. Honorary Degrees Committee (2011-2012)
- 5) Brought forward from 18 June 2012
  - a) Motion from the Chair, Honorary Degrees Committee (*attached*)
  - b) Academic Program Review Committee Prioritized Recommendations (*to be circulated*)
    - i. Ivan Curry School of Engineering (*revised Priority 1*)
    - ii. Environmental Science
    - iii. English and Theatre
    - iv. Languages and Literatures

- c) Senate Committee Annual Reports (*attached*)
    - i. Academic Integrity Committee (2011-2012) (*recommendation that the Committee be dissolved*)
    - ii. Archives Committee (2011-2012)
    - iii. Faculty Development Committee (2010-2011)
    - iv. Timetable, Instruction Hours and Examinations Committee (2011-2012) (*recommendation that the Committee be dissolved*)
    - v. Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee (2009-2010 and 2010-2011)
    - vi. Academic Technologies Committee (2011-2012) (*contains one recommendation for Senate*)
    - vii. Curriculum Committee
    - viii. Admission and Academic Standing Committee (Policy) (2011-2012)
    - ix. Open Acadia (2011-2012)
  - d) Possible Review of Senate Standing Committees (mandate, structure, membership)
- 6) New Business
- a) Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee Report to Senate (*attached*)
  - b) Report on Discrepancies in Senate Membership (*attached - contains one associated motion*)
  - c) Notice of Motion from the President of the Acadia Students' Union re: Senate Membership.
  - d) Report from the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (*attached*)

7) Other Business

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED  
Rosemary Jotcham  
Registrar and Secretary of Senate

**Motion from the Chair, Honorary Degrees Committee:**

That the Constitution and By-laws of the Senate of Acadia University, Article VIII. (h) be revised to reflect the new Terms of Reference as approved at the September 2011 meeting of Senate, as indicated below:

VIII. (h) HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE

AWARDS COMMITTEE FOR HONORARY DEGREES AND EMERITI  
DISTINCTION (AWARDS COMMITTEE)

- i. The membership of the ~~Honorary Degrees~~ **Awards** Committee shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:

The President, Chair

One member of the Faculty of Arts

One member of the Faculty of Professional Studies

One member of the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science

One member of the **Acadia Divinity College**/Faculty of Theology

**One member of the Library**

One lay member of either the Senate or the Board of Governors appointed by the Board

One member of the student body to be designated by the Student Representative Council \*

- ii. The ~~duties~~ **purpose** of the ~~Honorary Degrees~~ **Awards** Committee shall be **to**:

- a. ~~To solicit and receive suggestions for honorary degrees from the University community and to make recommendations thereon to Senate;~~  
b. ~~To receive, through the President, nominations for the appointment of Professores Emeriti and to make recommendations thereon to Senate.~~

1. **Invite nominations for Honorary Doctorate degrees and Professores, Librarian, and Archivists Emeriti awards.**
2. **Adjudicate the nominations; and**
3. **Recommend nominees thereon to Senate.**

## **Annual Report to Senate from the Academic Integrity Committee**

### **April 26, 2012**

#### **Committee Membership:**

Patricia Rigg, Emma Cochrane, Robert Pitter, Martin Tango, Rosemary Jotcham

The Senate Academic Integrity Committee met on April 12, 2012. The Committee reviewed its mandate and outstanding items from previous meetings.

Submissions from unit heads regarding their approach to academic integrity had previously been received and reviewed. It was clear from these submissions that units have developed procedures to deal with academic misconduct that best fit their discipline.

The need for the Committee to continue was discussed by the members. It was felt that, although academic integrity is an important subject, the Committee itself may not be required.

The Registrar circulates information to faculty each fall reminding them to stress the importance of the issue and the consequences of academic misconduct to their students and to report any issues of misconduct that arise. The Registrar maintains the list of academic offenders. This information is not shared with the Committee for reasons of confidentiality, but a brief summary could be provided to Senate each year by the Registrar.

Any additional policy requirements related to academic integrity could be undertaken by the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (Policy).

It was therefore suggested by the members that the Committee be dissolved.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Committee,  
Rosemary Jotcham

### **Senate Archives Committee Annual Report (2011-2012)**

#### Background:

The Senate Archives Committee has been without a Chair and Secretary since 2009. As a result, the Committee has not met in the past three years. Although inactive, the Committee membership has continued to be filled with representatives from the student body, faculty, University administration, general research community, and Baptist community.

In 2011, discussions were held concerning the status of this Committee and the possibility of merging with the Senate Library Committee. At that time it was agreed that the Senate Archives Committee and the Senate Library Committee should remain separate.

#### Recommendations:

1. The Senate Archives Committee remain separate from the Senate Library Committee.
2. The Senate Archives Committee should be rejuvenated.

## Report from the Faculty Development Committee.

### 1. Introduction.

The Faculty Development Committee was inactive for some time during 2009/10. Three faculty members were appointed to look broadly at the issue of faculty development and bring concise observations and recommendations to Senate. The Faculty Development Committee met on several occasions and respectively submit this report to Senate.

### 2. Faculty Development Committee Mandate.

The Faculty Development Committee was unclear of the precise mandate that the committee had and the specific areas of responsibility under its purview. Consequently the committee took a wide understanding of its role to include any and all areas that could be considered relevant to the development of members of Acadia University's four faculties (Arts, Science, Professional Studies & Theology). The committee excluded from its orbit of thought any person not appointed onto the faculty of Acadia University in a permanent contract, tenure track or tenured position. In doing so the committee also recognized that recommendations could also be applied to other teaching 'faculty' at the discretion of either Senate or the relevant Deans.

In particular our Justification for reviewing the FDC's mandate was prompted by the fact that the Senate Research Committee (SRC) duplicates the 'research' element of our mandate. The SRC is more widely representative of the university community and so is better equipped to handle issues directly relating to faculty research. Thus, the first recommendation of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) is that we request that the FDC's mandate be revised to exclude 'research'. This will allow us to focus more clearly on teaching development. The rationale being that quality of teaching and development of faculty teaching credentials as professional educators is core to the success of Acadia University and an expectation of students. The second recommendation is therefore that the mandate of this committee be altered to include to promotion of development of good pedagogical skills and qualifications within the university faculty as a priority area.

### 3. Development challenges.

The FDC discussed at length the nature of challenges and barriers to uptake to positive development of teaching skills within the university faculty. One immediate observation was that, with the exception of the Department of Education, it was not clear at all that many members of faculty had benefitted from being trained professionally as educators or teachers in their fields. This was noted as an observation that the committee would like the senate to be aware of together with the recognition that the role of professor and subject matter expert should be complimented by professional training in teaching.

The committee was also concerned to know some key facts that related to resources deemed by the committee as important to improving the opportunity to develop faculty.

These are:

(a) What has been the effect of reducing the Learning Commons teaching on faculty development?

(b) What was the take up in previous years on professional development offered through the university?

(c) What are the replacement 'vehicles' for internal training?

The answers to these questions were not known and subject to further work by the committee as a means of shedding light upon the need to improve development of faculty.

The anecdotal evidence suggested that the Learning Commons played a significant part in offering options for educational development for faculty. The committee therefore decided that in order to fill at least some of the void created by the recent loss of the Learning Commons, the FDC undertakes to develop a series of workshops on teaching, where we draw on the strengths of existing faculty who have been identified as particularly good teachers, who use innovative pedagogical techniques, and/or make use of innovative technologies in the classroom. It is envisioned that these workshops will provide an opportunity for faculty to share ideas around best practice. To this end, we intend the workshops to be somewhat informal and dialogical, with each workshop to be followed by a social event to further strengthen conversations and collaboration around teaching at Acadia. Strengths of teaching expertise and innovation should be showcased to ALL members of faculty. This is the third recommendation.

#### 4. Technology

In addition to the development of teaching skills the committee recognized that many students had a better grasp of technology and its application within the classroom than the member of faculty who was teaching. This was seen as a real concern and therefore the committee sees the development of faculty in use of technology within an educational environment as critical to professional competency.

In terms of technology training as a subset of best teaching practice we suggest the use of virtual communities, social media, blogs, ACORN, and integrating technology into teaching styles. The committee recommends that all faculty reach a minimum standard of operational knowledge in these areas.

#### 5. Development through research.

In regards to Research the first question that the committee sought to answer was 'is this our area?'. If the answer is yes, then do we ask for research as part of professional development to be in areas likely to benefit the university and society rather than unconnected 'novelty' research? The committee seeks to take advice in this area from members of Senate.

## **Timetable, Instruction Hours and Examinations Committee**

### **Report to Senate for June 2012**

The TIE Committee met electronically between November and December to discuss Calendar Dates. The dates received approval, by Senate, at the December meeting on December 12, 2011. There were no other issues brought to the TIE Committee during the 2011/2012 Academic Year.

It is the recommendation of the TIE (Timetable, Instruction Hours and Examinations) Committee that the Committee be disbanded and the duties of that Committee be the responsibility of the Registrar's Office. From the Registrar's Office perspective, we agree to assume the committee's responsibilities and that the Registrar will be available to act as a liaison to Senate regarding these issues wherever required. Therefore, the committee recommends that it cease to exist as a standing committee of Senate. There should be wide consultation with faculty to be sure that there is still input, but the consultation would be done differently via the Registrar's Office rather than through the committee structure.



ACADIA UNIVERSITY

Report of the SCHOLARSHIPS, PRIZES AND AWARDS COMMITTEE (SPAC) to SENATE for 2009-2010

REPORT DATE: May 16, 2012

SPAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Membership	July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010	July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011
Arts	Christian Thomas	Kerry Vincent
	Thomas Voss (Committee Chair)	Anna Saroli
	Julia Turner (Student Rep)	Christina Muehlberger (Student Rep)
Professional Studies	Scott Landry	Scott Landry
	Jun Yang	Igor Semenenko
	Robert McIntyre (Student Rep)	Emma Smith (Student Rep)
Pure & Applied Science	Michael Robertson	Michael Robertson
	Jeff Hooper	Jeff Hooper (Committee Chair)
	Emma Vaasjo (Student Rep)	Ashley Margeson (Student Rep)
Registrar or Delegate	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager of Scholarships and Financial Assistance	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager Scholarships and Financial Assistance
Financial Aid Counselor	Pamela D'Entremont (Committee Secretary)	Pamela D'Entremont (Secretary)

PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

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

MEETINGS DATES

Five full committee meetings were held during 2009-2010 on the following dates:

November 6, 2009

November 16, 2009

March 9, 2010

April 1, 2010

May 26, 2010

Numerous other meetings were also held between the SPAC Chair, Secretary, and Manager of Scholarships & Financial Assistance to decide upon various awards and matters.

AGENDAS, DISCUSSIONS and CONCLUSIONS

The following represents the main agenda topics:

1. Acadia Excellence Scholarship Program

The Committee re-affirmed their commitment to the Acadia Excellence Scholarship program with the inclusion of renewable monies for each of the four scholarship tiers. The scholarship tier levels depend on the grades of the incoming students.

2. Entrance Scholarship Application Process

As high school ranks are increasingly difficult to obtain, it was decided that this was no longer required by the incoming student and the entrance scholarship files would be ranked by weighted average for review of the top 150 files by the Committee.

The Committee also reviewed the use of the information collected on the scholarship information form and endorsement forms and for what average tier levels the information would be required. Changes were made to the scholarship information form questions.

3. Student Access to Numeric Grades for Scholarship Renewability

The University conditions of renewability refer to numeric benchmarks but students have access to only gpa and letter grades. The University needs to move toward students being able to access their numeric grades for scholarship purposes.

4. Entrance Scholarship Offers

To be competitive with other universities, our top entrance scholarships have been named and valued as follows:

- Chancellor's Scholarships valued at \$10,000 renewable
- Board of Governor's Scholarships valued at \$7,500 renewable
- Nova Scotia High School Tuition Scholarships valued at \$6,652 renewable
- President's Scholarships valued at \$5,000 renewable
- International Baccalaureate Scholarships valued at \$3,000 renewable

5. Awarding of 2010 Entrance Scholarships

Acadia offered entrance scholarships to 879 students of the incoming class for September 2010. This included renewable entrance scholarship offers to students with high school averages above 80% and transfer student applicants (in their first undergraduate degree) to Acadia. The top three tiers included a value towards the cost of residence. The acceptance rate for 2010 was 44% with 379 accepting their entrance scholarships (approximately 1.1 M).

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont  
Secretary

Jeff Hooper  
Chair

ACADIA UNIVERSITY

Report of the SCHOLARSHIPS, PRIZES AND AWARDS COMMITTEE (SPAC) to SENATE for 2010-2011

REPORT DATE: May 16, 2012

SPAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Membership	July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011	July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012
Arts	Kerry Vincent	Stephen Ahern
	Anna Saroli	Anna Saroli
	Christina Muehlberger (Student Rep)	Emma Cochrane (Student Rep)
Professional Studies	Scott Landry	Scott Landry
	Igor Semenenko	Igor Semenenko
	Emma Smith (Student Rep)	Colin Deal (Student Rep)
Pure & Applied Science	Michael Robertson	Bryan van der Ende
	Jeff Hooper (Committee Chair)	Jeff Hooper (Committee Chair)
	Ashley Margeson (Student Rep)	Sarah Sweet (Student Rep)
Registrar or Delegate	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager of Scholarships and Financial Assistance	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager Scholarships and Financial Assistance
Financial Aid Counselor	Pamela D'Entremont (Committee Secretary)	Pamela D'Entremont (Secretary)

PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

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

MEETINGS DATES

Three full committee meetings were held during 2010-2011 on the following dates:

December 3, 2010

March 25, 2011

March 31, 2011

Numerous other meetings were also held between the SPAC Chair, Secretary, and Manager of Scholarships & Financial Assistance to decide upon various awards and matters.

AGENDAS, DISCUSSIONS and CONCLUSIONS

The following represents the main agenda topics:

1. Acadia Excellence Scholarship Program

The Committee re-affirmed their commitment to the Acadia Excellence Scholarship program.

2. Entrance Scholarship Offers

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

Chancellor's Scholarships valued at \$10,000 renewable

Board of Governor's Scholarships valued at \$8,000 renewable

President's Scholarships valued at \$7,000 renewable

International Baccalaureate Scholarships valued at \$6,500 renewable

Nova Scotia High School Tuition Scholarships valued at \$6,500 renewable

3. Awarding of 2011 Entrance Scholarships

Acadia offered entrance scholarships to 1388 students of the incoming class for September 2011. This included renewable entrance scholarship offers to all incoming students (in their first undergraduate degree) with an average above 80%. The acceptance rate for 2011 was 49% with 679 accepting their entrance scholarships (approximately 1.6 M).

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont  
Secretary

Jeff Hooper  
Chair

**Academic Technologies Committee  
Annual Report to Senate**

**Membership (2011-2012):**

Dr. Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic.  
Mr. Duane Currie, Coordinator of Academic Technologies.  
Dr. Robert Pitter, Professional Studies.  
Dr. Danny Silver, Pure and Applied Science.  
Dr. Richard Cunningham, Arts.  
Mr. Mike Beazley, Librarian.  
Dr. Jeff Banks, Director of Open Acadia.  
Mr. Paul Steele, Technology Services.  
Mr. Colin Deal, Professional Studies Student Representative.  
Ms. Emma Cochrane, Professional Studies Student Representative.  
Ms. Sarah Sweet, Professional Studies Student Representative.  
**Chair:** Duane Currie. **Secretary:** Jeff Banks.

The Academic Technologies Committee has met three times this past year on February 15, May 2, and June 1. During the year, a number of subgroups have met and worked on recommendations for the Committee.

The Committee has developed the following recommendations for Technology Services:

- that until such time as another option is available, a reminder should be sent to faculty about backing up using software supported by Technology Services.
- that a central backup method be implemented for part-time faculty.

The Committee recommends to Senate:

- that technology requirements be incorporated into course scheduling.

Other activities:

- A subgroup working on classroom technology has also provided recommendations to the committee on maintenance priorities for classroom technology, and acknowledgment that although docks may be convenient when available, laptops supporting docks are becoming rare.
- A subgroup on communications strategy has collected initial feedback on communication needs and preferences of a subset of faculty.

Respectfully submitted by the Chair,

Duane Currie  
June 1, 2012

## SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT JUNE 18, 2012

### **Membership**

May Abou Zahra (FA, attended the first meeting); Emma Cochrane (student representative); Leo Elshof (FPS); Rosemary Jotcham (Registrar); Chris Killacky (ADC); David McMullin (FPAS); Anne Quéma (FA); Rob Raeside (FPAS); Roxanne Seaman (FPS); Ann Smith (Library); Sarah Sweet (student representative for Kyle Power).

### **Mandate**

The SCC reviewed curriculum submissions from the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science. For the benefit of new and returning members of the Committee, the first meeting began with a review of the mandate of the Committee as stipulated by Senate's Constitution. The mandate of the Committee is to recommend curriculum proposals for approval at Senate. In preparing these recommendations, the Committee members ensure that coherence and clarity are maintained while programs and courses are modified.

### **Process, comments, and two major issues**

Generally, the SCC consulted with several schools and departments to address minor problems such as the need to clarify the terms of curriculum proposals, or the need to meet the 60 word requirement for course descriptions. In all cases, the objectives are to ensure that students have access to clear and accurate information, and that programs maintain descriptive coherence.

Comment # 1: While it is not the Committee's mandate, let alone power, to make economic recommendations, the Committee's members wish to note that, in some cases, modifications were made to the curriculum in response to faculty reduction and / or resource reduction.

Comment # 2: With regard to interdisciplinary minors in BSc and BScH, Emma Cochrane and the Committee note that some courses in the interdisciplinary minors require extensive prerequisites. Students need to be advised on this matter.

Comment # 3: The SCC has modified language in question 18.c in curriculum forms 1 and 3 so as to replace the reference to "library staff" with "liaison librarian for the program."

- A major issue concerned the decision of the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science to modify its language requirement. The proposal was to replace the required "6 h English or one language other than English" with "6h from the Faculty of Arts selected from the courses with a significant writing component as listed at [www.science.acadiiau.ca/sigwrtingcourseslist](http://www.science.acadiiau.ca/sigwrtingcourseslist) or 6 h of a single language other than English." The SCC invited Peter Williams, Patricia Rigg, Barry Moody, and Romira Worvill to a meeting where the proposal could be debated and clarified. To sum up, P. Williams described the consultation process in the FPAS that led to the formulation of the proposed change, and stated that the chief objectives are to ensure that Science students develop significant reading and writing skills, and that they have access to a variety of courses suiting their interests. These include English courses, language courses, but also other Arts courses with a significant writing component. B. Moody argued that the practical rationale for making this change is to address the backlog of students who need to fulfill this requirement. P. Rigg and R. Worvill underlined the benefits that students derive from taking English and Languages courses (out of 24 students currently majoring in German, 7 are taking double majors in science). P. Rigg noted that first-year courses in English are capped for pedagogical reasons.

- At the end of January 2012, the members of the SCC had the opportunity to discuss Professor Zamlynny's proposal to add two questions to the curriculum form dealing with modifications to an existing course (1. Has the proposed modification been discussed with the course instructor? And 2. If yes, does the course instructor approve of the modification?). While appreciating the issue that Professor Zamlynny raised, the SCC decided not to sponsor his May 9, 2012. The motion of can be interpreted as reopening a process that will presumably have taken place within the department, the school, or the program. The proposal would indirectly redefine the SCC's mandate by ascribing to the Committee the capacity to function as an appeal body. Such a redefinition is not in the interest of faculty members.

### **Recommendations**

The SCC recommended the adoption of the following resolutions:

1. That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Arts be approved.
2. That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Professional Studies be approved.
3. That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences be approved.

Furthermore, the SCC recommended that:

in the event of major interfaculty as well as interdisciplinary curriculum changes or innovations, a mechanism and structure be established that will ensure that proper consultation take place among Faculties.

Rationale: While the SCC recommends the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science's curriculum change for Senate's approval, its members are concerned that incomplete communication took place between the FPAS and the FA before the change to the language requirement was submitted to the SCC. It is also the view of the members of the Committee that the SCC is not currently mandated to monitor major interfaculty curriculum changes. The problem is as follows: in the case of curriculum changes affecting two programs, the SCC routinely invite members of the schools and departments concerned to discuss the proposals. However, in the case of major changes affecting two or more faculties, the SCC is not in a position to decide who should be selected to discuss an interfaculty curriculum change.

### **Outcome**

The recommendation was split into two separate motions that were passed by Senate on May 9, 2012. The Academic Program Review Committee has been asked to propose to Senate a mechanism and structure fostering proper consultation among Faculties in the course of major interfaculty curriculum changes. Further, the APRC's forthcoming recommendations for the recently reviewed WGST program may serve as suggestions for the improvement of processes and structures in the context of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary programs.

**ADMISSION & ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEE (Policy)**

**Annual Report to Senate for 2011-2012**

August 30, 2012

**Committee Members 2011-2012**

Tom Herman (Chair)  
Rosemary Jotcham (Secretary)  
Peter Williams (Dean)  
Barry Moody (Acting Dean)  
Heather Hemming (Dean) (first term); Glyn Bissix (Acting Dean) (second term)  
Jeff Banks (Acting Director)  
Patricia Rigg  
Christian Thomas (first term); Leigh Whaley (second term)  
Ian Hutchinson  
David Piper  
Barbara Anderson  
Paul Arnold  
Bruce Fawcett  
Kyle Power

**Purpose of Committee:**

To interpret and to apply the conditions of admissions and academic standing as outlined in the University Calendar and to make recommendations to Senate with respect to its policy as it relates to admissions, failures, and academic regulations.

**Meeting:**

There were no meetings of this committee held in 2011-12.

Respectfully submitted by the Chair,



Tom Herman  
Vice-President Academic  
Chair, Admission and Academic Standing Committee (Policy)



## **Board of Open Acadia**

### **Annual Report to Senate for 2011-12**

August 30, 2012

Board Members for 2011-2012:

Dr. Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic, Chair

Dr. Robert Perrins, Dean of Arts

Dr. Peter Williams, Acting Dean of Pure and Applied Science

Dr. Heather Hemming, Dean of Professional Studies

Ms. Rosemary Jotcham, Registrar

Ms. Mary MacVicar, Associate Vice-President Finance and Treasurer

Vacant, Student Representative

Dr. Jeffrey Banks, Acting Director of Open Acadia

---

The Board of Open Acadia did not meet over the 2011-12 academic year.

Open Acadia had a busy and successful completion to the 2011-2012 year. Online course offerings continued to grow, with 2011-2012 enrollment increases of 22% in online undergraduate courses and 15% in online graduate courses. Like many other institutions in Canada, we see this upward trend in online and blended learning continuing in 2012-2013, and beyond. Evidence for the competitive nature of online courses was seen by the fact that the number of exams proctored for other institutions more than doubled in the past year. Undergraduate and Graduate Intersession continued to be strong, with more than 80 undergraduate courses delivered this past year, and more than 40 courses in the Summer Institute for Graduate Education. Enrolment in the TESOL and French Proficiency programs also remained strong.

The growth experienced in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program last year has slowed due to a redirection of students from one geographic region by their Cultural Bureau. This, along with a targeted international recruiting strategy made possible by moving recruiting resources to Enrolment Services has allowed for a diversification of the EAP program. It is felt that this will make for more dynamic and enriched classroom environments for students and teachers alike as well as allowing for more sustainable growth in the future. The 3000 Bridging level (first piloted in 2009) continues to be a successful and rewarding experience for students. The percentage of students that graduate from this level remains between 70-80%, and more than 90% of these students continue on to degree programs in the Acadia credit program. Credit courses that are offered in the Bridging level continue to be taken from the Faculty of Arts, and the number of professors expressing interest in teaching these courses has increased. We now have a potential group of 6 or 7 professors who would be willing to teach for the EAP Bridging level – a great success for the EAP program.

Open Acadia continues to work closely with Schools and Departments to offer flexibility to our students via innovative programming options. The growth in online and distance delivery of programs and courses has had a significant effect on our human resource capacity. Given the continuing growth in demand for delivery of programs to geographically dispersed students, we are actively researching online tools that will enhance the personalized education experience that our faculty can provide for students. The competitive nature of this area demands that we continue to keep pace with quality of Instructional Design within this space.

As our enrollment and programs expand, Client Service Staff continue to streamline processes to ensure our diverse learners receive the excellent service they have come to expect.

Other activities of OA and its partners that would be of interest to Senate include:

- The School of Education has started two new graduate Counselling cohorts for PEI (through an innovative collaboration with UPEI) and in the Cape Chignecto region of the province (in support of the CCRSB School Board). Other specialized cohorts are set to start this year for Music Educators (one cohort focusing on Elementary and another on Secondary), as well as for a cohort of educators wanting to focus on Creativity in Teaching.
- In collaboration with the School of Education and the Dalhousie College of Medical Education, the second M.Ed. cohort for Health Interprofessionals is set to begin in the fall of 2012.
- Open Acadia is also working with the School of Education, the Nova Scotia Department of Education, and multiple Academic Units within Acadia on a number of new Certificate Programs for NS teachers, including ones in support of teachers in Family Studies, Middle School Mathematics, and Computer Science.
- Our affiliations with the Dalhousie School of Nursing (Yarmouth Site), 14 Wing Greenwood, and the Class Afloat program also continue, with courses being offered through Open Acadia throughout the coming year.
- Acadia Lifelong Learning Centre - ALL continues to be a very important program, not only for Open Acadia, but also for the University. Our 2012-13 slate of courses are scheduled and the program will launch at the annual potluck event on August 29th, 2012. Based on an enthusiastic response to surveys, we are providing a slightly different array of courses this year, focusing on our members' suggestions, including more courses off-campus in an effort to reach out to members who do not live within Wolfville.
- Beijing Normal University - In July, 2012, Acadia hosted 28 students from Beijing Normal University – Zhuhai (BNUZ) for a 4 week program of English Language studies, Canadian culture classes, and facilitated field trips around Nova Scotia. This successful program marked the beginning of an important relationship between BNUZ and Acadia. The programming not only improved their English, but it also gave them the opportunity to immerse themselves in Acadia's true spirit of community and achievement. As a result of this program, at least five students applied and were offered admission to attend Acadia full-time in the 2012-13 academic year.
- Canadian Coast Guard College - The Department of Fisheries and Oceans renewed its \$212,000 contract with Open Acadia for delivery of the 2012-13 Physical Education program at the Canadian Coast Guard College in Sydney, NS. Classes began in September.
- Huggins High School Science Seminar - The 27th Annual Huggins High School Science Seminar was held on Friday, May 4<sup>th</sup>, with 70 high school students from around the province in attendance. In 2012, the theme was "Dive Into Science", with presentations from Dr. Maia Hoeberechts of NEPTUNE Canada, Richard Zurawski, Dr. Michael Stokesbury, and Dr. Vlad Zamlynny, and a very successful Lifeboat Debate.

Operationally, Open Acadia continues to manage program costs very well, and both undergraduate and graduate credit programs finished the fiscal year impressively, with increases over projected revenues and a good standing on year-over-year expenses. Open Acadia's net contribution to the University for 2011-12 continued to exceed previous years and grew in excess of %45 this year (surpassing budget expectation by %35). As always Open Acadia credits the quality and enthusiasm of its Academic partners for any success.

Respectfully Submitted,



Tom Herman, Ph.D.  
Vice-President, Academic  
Chair, Board of Open Acadia

## Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee

### Report to Senate September 2012

On July 31, 2012, I received the following message from Dr. Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic:

In accordance with the procedural guidelines of the TTTCAC, I am notifying you in your capacity as Chair that regrettably no tenure-track searches will be authorized for 2012-13.

Therefore, as decided at the June Senate meeting, the TTTCAC will not be performing its ranking procedures this year, unless circumstances change.

Appended to this report, you will find the brief requests from units, listed in the order in which they were received.

Respectfully submitted,

John J. Guiney Yallop, Chair (Interim)

From Dr. Andrew Biro:

[T]he Department of Politics wishes to make a case for the approval of **two (2) tenure-track positions in our department**. This is the same request that we (then the Department of Political Science) made last year. Part of the case for these positions has to do with the integrity of our teaching of the discipline: The fields of International Relations and Political Thought are essential to the teaching of Politics/Political Science, and we have been left with holes in these areas with the retirements of Drs. Grieve (IR) and Pycrz (PT) in 2011. The other part of the case rests on student demand (numbers): POLS FCEs and majors are both continuing to increase, despite the shrinking faculty complement in our department. Over the last year, the stresses created by this increased workload have become increasingly apparent.

From Dr. Paul W. Doerr:

The Classics unit of the History and Classics department would like to request a tenure-track appointment to replace Dr. Beert Verstraete, who retired on July 1, 2011. We strongly believe that three full time professors are needed to maintain the Classics program which has been a part of Acadia since its origins and which continues to attract students to its courses, including Latin and Greek.

The History unit of the History and Classics department would like to request a tenure-track appointment to replace Dr. Barry Moody, who will be retiring next June, and who is not teaching courses in the department this year due to his commitments as Dean. This appointment is necessary to maintain the overall strength of the department which continues to draw large numbers of students.

From Dr. Rob Raeside:

The Department of Earth & Environmental Science requests the position vacated by L Lusby in 2011 be filled. This position is required to provide courses and thesis supervision in the policy and legal areas of Environmental Science, where the department currently has no expertise. This component was part of our successful accreditation process in 2010, and its lack will jeopardize our status with ECO. Courses no longer offered are ENVS 3113, 1643, 3313 and 4423 and 1023 can only be offered by overload teaching.

From Dr. Jeff Hennessy:

The School of Music requests a tenure track replacement position in Historical Musicology. Music History is a major portion of the curriculum in all music degrees and is currently taught almost exclusively by part-time faculty leaving us the only comprehensive music school in the country without a full-time music historian.

From Dr. Rene Murphy:

SRMK TTTCAC position requests for 2012-13

An Athletic Therapy position in Kinesiology (replacing Dr. Susan Markham-Starr). This person would be instrumental in developing the Canadian Athletic Therapy Association (CATA) certified program at Acadia and would greatly increase the number of students who could be trained in the Sport Injury Assessment and Management (SIAM) program. As this is the major draw for incoming KINE students, increasing the capacity will also help maintain enrolment into the future. Moreover, Acadia would be the only program east of Montreal delivering a certified athletic therapy program in Canada (and there is a huge demand for this to occur).

A replacement position for Dr. Wendy Bedingfield to teach in the Kinesiology program and most likely work in the area of Physical Education and Sport. The current Kinesiology curriculum is only a few courses short of being able to be accredited for Physical Education. If we added this individual, we would anticipate drawing new students to Acadia who currently choose to go elsewhere to gain the training to eventually become PE teachers/coaches. As coach education will be moving to the University setting in Canada, Acadia could lead in the Atlantic provinces by beginning to implement this in its curriculum.

A position to replace Dr. Brenda Robertson's position in the BRM. This person would have expertise linking and crossing Recreation Management, Community Development and Sustainability. Due to the two retirements in the BRM faculty, the complement has gone from 5 to 3 (with a 9.5mo CLT for this academic year) and is not sustainable, especially with the 3 full time faculty members heavily involved with the ESST program.

From Dr. Barb Anderson:

The School of Nutrition and Dietetics, which currently has a total of three tenure/tenure-track positions (including the Director of the School), requires an additional tenure-track position to support our growing enrolment, to address the research demands of the Centre for the Sensory Research of Food, and to build a consumer food stream for students as an integral component of the Nutrition and Dietetics program. With our steadily increasing student enrolment (a 70% increase from 2004 to 2011), and our high student to faculty ratio, the School of Nutrition and Dietetics is challenged to meet program demands, therefore hiring a tenure-track faculty member to strengthen our teaching, research and community service will continue to ensure program viability, and allow us to enhance what is acknowledged as a high quality undergraduate program.

From Dr. Darcy Benoit:

Given the retirement of Dr. Rick Giles, our School has been left with 6 faculty members and currently runs in danger of losing our specialization in Game Development and having to greatly reduce our intake of MSc students. Our loss of faculty over the past several years, combined with a first year class that has been growing in size for the past several years, puts us in a position where a tenure track faculty member would be a great asset to the School and Acadia.

From Dr. Peter McLeod

The Psychology department requests a position to replace Dr. Lachlan McWilliams, who resigned unexpectedly on June 21st 2012. The Psychology department is amongst the largest on campus in terms of students served (e.g., largest first-year class sizes on campus; third in FCE% across Arts & Science), and has also been one of the fastest-growing departments in recent years (e.g., biggest average FCE% increase across campus last five years), yet is already relatively understaffed (e.g., substantially lower faculty complement than other units that teach comparable numbers of students). The loss of Dr. McWilliams will increase our already-large class sizes, threaten the existence of our popular Applied Psychology Option (N=24 students), and almost certainly result in us having to suspend admission to our very successful 64 year old graduate program in psychology, which trains a substantial proportion of the practicing clinical psychologists in the province.

From Dr. David F. Duke:

I write to you in your capacity as Chair of the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee (TTTCAC) to request, under Articles 1.3 and 1.6 of the document "Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee (TTTCAC) Procedures, Criteria, and Timelines, June 2012", a formal request for an Addition to Complement for the Environment and Sustainability Studies Program (ESST). Currently there are no faculty positions directly attached to this program, despite it accumulating more than 70 majors as it moves into its third year of operation.

From Dr. John Eustace:

Below is the rationale from the Department of English and Theatre for our request to hire an 18th Century Literature specialist:

Two unfilled positions have necessitated a ten course cut from English offerings. Given increased enrollments, we are struggling to offer core courses in 18th Century Literature and Introductory English.

From Dr. Ian Hutchinson:

APPLICATION: For authorization to fill a tenure-track appointment to teach Accounting

RATIONALE: The Manning School currently offers twelve courses in the area of Accounting. All but one of these courses are recognized by each of Canada's three professional accountancy bodies and may be used to garner advanced standing in educational programs leading to the professional accounting designations (CA, CGA, CMA). We are at risk of losing this advanced standing status if we are unable to offer these courses. The advanced standing status is paramount in attracting students to our accounting major, one of the most popular majors in the School.

From Dr. Romira Worvill:

The French section of the Department of Languages and Literatures would like to make a case for a tenure track position and you will find my justification below.

The French unit has recently lost two tenures stream positions: one due to an unanticipated early retirement (December 2010) and the other resulting from the decision not to renew a probationary tenure-stream contract (June 2012). These two departures, coming on top of other position losses, will have a significant impact on our service courses and on our Major programme. We are losing four sections of the entry-level language courses that students need to meet Core requirements and we are now unable to offer the advanced language courses that are a requirement for the French major.

From Dr. Jim Sacouman:

SOCI requires 2 tenure-stream positions that are rank-ordered as follows:

1. Beginning in 2013-14, in the area of Sociological Methods, both Qualitative and Quantitative (a position formerly held by Phyllis Rippeyoung). The courses to be covered are a required central requirement in all of our programmes (Major, Honours, Masters); the position was vacated by Phyllis Rippeyoung.
2. Beginning in 2014-15, a position in Ethnocultural Diversity and Racialization (a position formerly held by Kurt Bowen). This position is a crucial component of all Sociology and Anthropology programmes in Canada and we now have no dedicated scholar in the field.

### Report on Senate Membership Discrepancies in the By-laws

By: Diane Holmberg, Chair of Senate

Barb Anderson, By-laws Committee Member

As reported to Senate last year, the Chair noted several discrepancies between various membership lists for Senate. After consultation with the By-laws Committee, it was agreed that Dr. Holmberg and Professor Anderson would investigate these discrepancies and report suggested resolutions to Senate. Each issue is identified below, along with a recommended solution.

There are four different places where the membership of Senate is outlined:

**List A**, on pages 1 and 2 of the list located here:

[http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl\\_files/sites/senate/Committees%20and%20Membership/COM12-13.pdf](http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/senate/Committees%20and%20Membership/COM12-13.pdf), is an itemized list, identifying each member of Senate by name and role, along with “Procedures for Appointment”, noted below. The Procedures for Appointment seem to be compiled partially from the By-laws, partially from Faculty constitutions, and partially from past practice. This list has traditionally been the one used as a guide to following vacancies on Senate, and thus best represents current practices.

**List B**, on the bottom of page 2 of the document noted above, is labeled “Makeup of Senate”, and outlines the overall composition of Senate. It seems to be a slightly abbreviated version of List C.

**List C**, located on page 2 of the Constitution and By-laws of Senate, located here:

[http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl\\_files/sites/senate/Constitution%20ByLaws/CompleteSenate.BylawsJanuary12.pdf](http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/senate/Constitution%20ByLaws/CompleteSenate.BylawsJanuary12.pdf), lays out the full composition of Senate. As this list is in the Constitution, it best represents how things “should be” (unless it is discovered that properly approved changes in Senate were not reflected in this copy of the Constitution).

**List D**, located on page 38 of the Constitution, is labeled “Appendix A – Membership”. It provides a historical record, by laying out the composition of Senate as established in May 1985, and noting any changes since then.

Please note that any changes to “the composition of Senate or the term of office of any of its members or the composition of the Executive Committee of the Senate or the term of office of any of its members” requires 30 days’ notice given to Senate, followed by a 2/3 majority vote in favour of the motion, AND 30 days’ notice to the Board of Governors, followed by a 2/3 majority vote.

---

#### Issue #1

Lists A, C, and D refer to the “Vice-President, Student Affairs”, while List B refers to the “Provost”. Both titles are outdated, as the position is now called “Vice-President (Enrolment and Student Services)”.



**Recommendation #1**

Change the current title in all four lists. The change to List C will require Notice of Motion and a formal vote in Senate, as it is a change to the By-laws. The other lists can follow, once approved.

A check via e-mail with the Chair of the Board of Governors to see whether this change would be interpreted as a “change in the composition of Senate” is required. Most likely the answer is, ‘no,’ but if yes, approval from the Board of Governors is required too.

---

**Issue # 2**

Lists A, B, and C refer to the “Chief Financial Officer”. List D uses the correct current term, “Vice-President, Administration.”

**Recommendation #2**

Change to the current title in lists A, B, and C. The change to List C will require Notice of Motion and a formal vote in Senate, as it is a change to the By-laws. The other lists can follow, once approved.

A check via e-mail with the Chair of the Board of Governors to see whether this change would be interpreted as a “change in the composition of Senate” is required. Most likely the answer is, ‘no,’ but if yes, approval from the Board of Governors is required too.

---

**Issue #3**

The Chief Financial Officer / Vice President Administration is noted as a non-voting position in Lists A, C, and D. It is not indicated as being non-voting in List B.

**Additional Information**

List D indicates that the position was changed to non-voting status at the April 1999 meeting of Senate. Those minutes are not available on-line, so we have not corroborated this statement ourselves, but have no reason to doubt it. The position has certainly been a non-voting one in recent years.

**Recommendation #3**

Change List B to indicate the non-voting status of the position, as its omission on that list appears to be an oversight.

---

**Issue #4**

There are discrepancies in the voting status of the Faculty of Theology representative. Lists A and C both refer to the Dean of Theology plus one Theology representative, who is not explicitly noted as non-voting, and therefore is presumed to have voting status. List B refers to the Dean of Theology (within the “Four Academic Deans” category), plus one voting rep AND one non-voting rep from Theology. List D notes that the category of “27 members of faculty” was increased to 28 with the addition of a member of the Faculty of Theology, who is normally to be non-voting, but will have voting rights when the Dean is absent. It further notes that the section about voting rights had not been approved by the Board.

**Additional Information**

A search of past Senate minutes showed that on May 9, 2007, Senate passed a motion to grant voting status to the member from the Faculty of Theology. Specifically, the member’s designation as “non-voting” was to be removed from List C. The minutes of September 10, 2007 note that the Board of Governors approved this change.

**Recommendation #4**

Update lists B and D to reflect the correct status, i.e., Theology is represented by the Dean and by one voting member from Theology. No need for By-laws changes or Board involvement, as it was previously passed.

---

**Issue #5**

Lists A, B, and C refer to both the University Librarian, and a professional librarian, elected by the professional librarians. There is no mention of the second position in List D.

**Additional Information**

The minutes of May 9, 2007 indicate that Senate passed a motion to add “A professional librarian from among members of the University Community holding appointments as professional librarians” to the membership of Senate. The minutes of September 10, 2007 note that the Board had approved this addition.

**Recommendation # 5**

Update list D to reflect the addition.

---

The voting status of the ASU Student President (voting vs. non-voting) is unclear. Lists A, B, and C do not indicate that it is a non-voting position, implying it should be voting. List D specifies it as a non-voting position. List C has a footnote indicating that voting status was conferred August 2007.

### **Additional Information**

An electronic search of the minutes indicates that the ASU President was added to Senate membership as a non-voting position in September 1999. This addition was confirmed by the Board, as announced at the November 1999 meeting of Senate. Electronic searches of the minutes from 1999 - present have so far not yielded any indication that the status was ever changed to voting; however, we may just not be using the right keywords. The footnote indicates that voting status was conferred in August 2007, but there was no Senate meeting in August. The minutes for September 2007 indicate the Board had approved the voting status of the professional librarian and Theology reps, but there is no mention of the ASU President.

### **Recommendation #6**

Given that three of the four lists suggest the position is a voting one, that seems the most likely intent, and it has been treated as a voting position for some years. The student Senate reps should bring forward a motion to confer voting status on the ASU President. The change will have to be approved by the Board of Governors.

---

### **Issue #7**

There is no clear indication in any list of how the Faculty of Theology Student representative is to be selected. There are also some other possible inconsistencies across lists in the specifics of student representation and election. List A lists seven student positions in total: The President of the Student Union (ex officio), then six others are named with specific roles: The Student VPA, one grad student, and one student from each of Arts, Professional Studies, Science, and Theology [note that it is not specified whether the latter four students would necessarily be undergrad or grad students]. List B refers to the President, Student Union, plus six students (no further specifics). List C refers to the Student Union President plus six other students, at least one of whom shall be a graduate student (no further specifics). List D includes the President of the Student Union in the list of ex officio members. It also notes that there shall be five (not six) additional student members in one place; however, it does indicate six additional student members in another place. It also notes that the Board of Governors at its October 1992 meeting recommended (but did not require) that one of the additional students shall be a graduate student.

Note that election procedures are also potentially problematic. In both Lists A and C, it states that undergraduate Students shall be appointed by Acadia's SRC, and graduate students shall be appointed by the Graduate Student's Association (list D states that it is recommended that the graduate student be selected under the auspices of the GSA). The Theology student (who will most often be a graduate student, but could possibly be an undergraduate) is not explicitly covered in either group, and it is unclear who has traditionally chosen this representative. Furthermore, under the current wording, "at least one" of the additional students should be a graduate student, but in theory it could be more, or even all, graduate students – there are no places set aside explicitly for undergraduate students, even though in practice the ASU has for a number of years appointed four of the students.

**Additional Information**

The September 10, 2007 minutes contain a motion to “change the entry [in the Constitution and By-laws] starting with “Five students...” to read: “Six students, at least one of whom shall be a Graduate Student.” The stated rationale was “to include another student on Senate, in order to allow for the SRC Theology Representative to have a seat.” Note there is no longer a Theology Representative on the SRC, as they now have their own student association, the Acadia Divinity College Student Association.

**Recommendation #7**

- (a) Change to one portion of List D to accurately reflect the increase to six students (plus ASU President). All other lists, and the motion from September 2007 noted above, state that the correct number is six, not five.
  - (b) To increase clarity, change list C to further delineate the breakdown of the student representatives. Have the list specify that members shall include the Student Union President (ex officio), plus four undergraduate student representatives, one graduate student representative, and one student representative from the Faculty of Theology (total = ASU President plus 6 additional students, as is current practice). As this change does alter the specified membership of Senate as per the Constitution, it will require both Senate and Board of Governors approval.
  - (c) Change the Constitution, Part III bullet point 4, to include the process for selecting the Theology Student representative. This change to the Constitution will require Notice of Motion and Senate approval.
  - (d) Clarify existing voting procedures, as needed. The graduate student rep will continue to be chosen by the Graduate Student Association, as is current practice. Five undergraduate student reps will come from the SRC, as is current practice. One of the reps is the President of the SRC who is ex-officio on Senate and the SRC is free to choose / allot the other four positions as they wish. The tradition has been to have one seat for the student VPA, and one seat for a student rep from each of the three Faculties; however, that breakdown is simply tradition, and not mandated by Senate’s Constitution. The SRC could change their internal allotment in future without consulting Senate, if they so desire. For clarity, update the “Procedures for Appointment” section of List A to indicate that fact.
  - (e) Update all lists to indicate changes recommended in 7b and 7c, if and when approved.
- 

**Issue #8**

In List D, when listing the membership of Senate, it states that one member shall be “the Dean of Theology (or the Associate Dean)”. No other list mentions the Associate Dean. Furthermore, there is no longer an Associate Dean of Theology (although there is an Academic Dean).

**Additional Information**

In an electronic search of Senate minutes back to 1999, the only mention of an Associate Dean was in 2000, when the Associate Dean of Theology, who had been acting as the Senate rep, resigned.

**Recommendation #8**

Remove the reference to the Associate Dean from List D. With two voting reps from Theology now, the need to have an alternative representative is reduced. The Dean of Theology is welcome to invite the Academic Dean, or any other member of Theology, as a guest to speak to Senate when their expertise would be valuable.

---

**Issue #9**

List A states, accurately, that there are 57 positions in Senate, including the Deputy Chair; those 57 positions are currently filled by 55 persons (Paul Doerr is both a Faculty of Arts rep and the Deputy Chair; Sara Lochhead is both the University Librarian and VP Enrolment and Student Services). List B does not state the number, but it works out to 56 positions, as it omits the Deputy Chair. List C does not state the number, but it works out correctly to the 57 positions. List D states that there are “55 members” of Senate. The number of ex officio members is stated as being 18, but should be 19 if you include the Deputy Chair (but note, the Deputy Chair will also always be a faculty rep, so the number of persons will always be at least one less than the number of positions). The number of “elected members” (i.e., faculty members) is stated as being 28, but should be 29, as the professional librarian was omitted.

**Recommendation #9**

For clarity, note in lists B and D that there are 57 positions in total, but the number of persons may be less than the number of positions. Add the Deputy Chair to List B. Add the Deputy Chair and the professional librarian to List D.

---

As Dr. Holmberg cannot make motions in Senate, Professor Anderson moves that:

Senate approves the recommendations as outlined in this document, and asks the Chair and the By-Laws Committee to work together to ensure the changes noted are acted upon.

**Notice of Motion from the President, Acadia Students' Union:**

Be it resolved that the President of the Acadia Students' Union, as a current ex-officio member of Senate, shall be conferred full voting rights.

## **DRAFT REPORT FROM ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE TO SENATE – MAY 9, 2012**

### **SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES**

The committee met on 16 occasions between September 15, 2011 and April 25, 2012. Agendas, minutes, relevant materials and collected data were placed on a Sharepoint site for the committee.

The first meeting was taken up with organizational issues, but the committee quickly identified the need to review the University Strategic Plan and conduct a “State of the Unit” survey. The committee also identified the need to gather “best practices” information from other universities. Discussion of the exact wording and format for the State of the Unit survey occupied much time over subsequent meetings.

At the October 27 meeting the committee passed four motions that determined its direction for the next series of meetings. First, a discussion of the APPC’s work was to be added to the agenda of the three Faculty Councils, (actions which did take place). Second, a discussion of the APPC was to be added to the agenda of the next Faculty meeting. Third, a university Town Hall meeting was to take place to discuss the APPC as well. The latter two actions were to have taken place *following* the results of the Unit Surveys, so discussions could be productively guided. Finally, the APPC agreed to generate a flow map and time-line of the current formal and informal planning processes at Acadia.

In early November the committee discussed the possibility of compiling an online survey on Academic Planning at Acadia and continued to work on the wording of the Unit Survey. The committee also decided at this time to present the draft version of the Unit Survey to the Faculty Councils.

Meetings of the committee through-out the fall term saw ongoing discussions over whether or not the committee should make recommendations, and if so, what form those recommendations should take (see the minutes of the meeting of December 8). These discussions continued into April. However, at the meeting of December 8, the Committee did agree that: 1) we had neither ruled in nor ruled out recommendations; 2) we would let the conversation go where it wants to go and; 3) if we did subsequently agree on a recommendation that it would be acceptable to make it in the report.

The State of the Unit survey was completed by the end of the year and distributed in January. It was at this time that the committee experienced a turnover in membership and difficulties in finding a meeting time that could accommodate all the new members.

Meetings in early 2012 focused on reviewing the Strategic Plan and compiling the Planning Flow Chart. By the time of the February 20 meeting, the committee co-chairs had received 22 responses to the Unit Survey. The Committee then formed five sub-committees to identify the themes arising from the survey responses. By the middle of April the Committee had compiled summaries of the survey responses, collected information of planning processes at other universities, completed the academic planning time line and flow charts.

At the April 25 meeting, the committee passed the following motion: “The APPC requests from Senate a one-month extension of its mandate in order to provide a set of options for academic planning at Acadia University”.

Additional materials, including the mandate of the committee and reports from subcommittees addressing a) the unit survey, b) existing Acadia academic planning processes and timelines, and c) scan of planning processes at other universities, are attached.

## **1. Mandate of Academic Planning and Priorities Committee -**

This ad hoc committee shall serve at the pleasure of Senate, for a period not to exceed one year. The committee’s composition, mandate, and procedures shall be reviewed by Senate no later than the May 2012 Senate meeting, at which point the committee might be disbanded completely, continued in the same or modified form, or replaced with a standing committee.

Duties:

This committee’s goal shall be to gather and synthesize information relevant to identifying the ongoing academic goals and priorities of the University. In pursuit of this goal, the committee shall:

- (1) Consult widely with all relevant sectors
- (2) Foster discussions at all levels of the academic sector
- (3) Maintain channels of communication with Faculty Councils. For example, the committee might encourage units, faculties and interdisciplinary Programs to engage in self-studies to identify their short-term and long-term plans and priorities; it might facilitate discussion and sharing of information across units, faculties and Programs; it might conduct broad-scale surveys, town hall meetings, etc., to gather information and opinions from across campus.
- (4) Endeavor to provide relevant data to all those who need it to inform these discussions (e.g., financial information; enrolment information; information from other institutions; information from other committees, etc.).

Through its chairs, the committee shall report regularly to Senate on its procedures and its progress throughout the year, with the initial report on the procedures and mapping of how the committee will function to come to Senate no later than October 2011. Its goal shall be to begin to forge some consensus across the academic sector regarding where we are now, where we want to be in the future (e.g., five years from now), and how we can best get to where we want to be, given relevant constraints and opportunities.

## **2. Unit Surveys**

### **Unit Survey Questions**

- 1) The mission of Acadia University is “to provide a personalized and rigorous liberal education; promote a robust and respectful scholarly community; and inspire a diversity of students to become critical thinkers, lifelong learners, engaged citizens, and responsible global leaders.”

Please describe to what extent this mission is being fulfilled/supported by:

- a) University
- b) Administration



- c) Your Faculty
  - d) Your Unit/Program
- 2) Does your unit/program use Acadia University's current Strategic Plan?  
[ ] Yes                    [ ] No  
If no, please explain why not.  
If yes, explain the extent and ways in which the Strategic Plan influences your unit/program's academic planning.  
What are the shortcomings of the Strategic Plan?
- 3) What are the most important formal and informal academic planning processes for your unit/program?  
a) Which aspects of the current academic planning processes work well for your unit/program?  
b) Which aspects of the current academic planning processes do not work well for your unit/program?  
c) What suggestions do you have that may enhance the planning processes at Acadia University?
- 4) Within the overall context of Acadia University, what are your unit/program's most important academic goals and priorities (short-term and/or long-term)?  
a) Staffing  
b) Course offerings  
c) Equity
- 5) What are the most significant challenges (resource-related and structural) that are currently facing your unit/program? In the event that your unit/program is experiencing particular challenges, please provide suggestions for improvement.

### Identified Themes in the State of the Unit Responses

Each member of the committee reviewed the documents on their own, then the group met together to discuss and determine the themes. After a lengthy conversation the following themes and potential solutions were identified:

- 1) **Theme:** Need for guiding principles in all decision-making due to concerns that decisions are being made only from a financial point of view.  
**Implication(s):** Determination of a set of guiding principles for the university to insure decisions are made in the best interest of the mission.
- 2) **Theme:** While most agree with the goals and overall message of the 2006 strategic plan, it is rarely consulted. There is a disconnect between the current reality and the plan.  
**Implication(s):** Review and/or reaffirm the strategic plan. Insure that mission driven planning is taking place in the academic sector. Insure that plans for research, fundraising, technology, distance education, etc. are considered and incorporated.

- 3) **Theme:** Support for the current administration and Deans was evident, however there are still concerns regarding communications, assessment and transparency.  
**Implication(s):** Improve mechanisms for communication between the levels (admin, deans, heads/directors, faculty, staff) and across faculties and sectors, including Open Acadia. Develop new models for communication: network vs. top down and bottom up. Increase the opportunities for communication for Heads/Directors, formal or informal.
- 4) **Theme:** Personalized education is being threatened. Much concern regarding the arbitrariness of Complement MOU in the CA.  
**Implication(s):** Importance of communication and leadership at all levels.
- 5) **Theme:** Concerns that we are in survival mode, only “coping” rather than exercising thoughtful planning. Constant state of crisis.  
**Implication(s):** Importance of communication and leadership at all levels. Emphasize the need for an overall plan.
- 6) **Theme:** Structural/Procedural inefficiencies or barriers: timetabling, technology limiting best practices (e.g. cross listing courses), use of FCE allocations, outdated rooms and labs, aging lab equipment.  
**Implication(s):** Review of the internal processes.
- 7) **Theme:** Focus on excellence and student engagement. Importance of the autonomy of the units to deliver and adapt programs, contrasted with concerns about silo mentality and entrenchment.  
**Implication(s):** Support and retain faculty, encourage dialogue.
- 8) **Theme:** Frustration with unit reviews, inability to implement recommendations, length of the process, accreditation requirements.  
**Implication(s):** Revisit the process, look for efficiencies or improvements. Connect diagnostic elements of unit reviews to decision-making processes.
- 9) **Theme:** Lack of an administrative home, and support and direction for IDST.  
**Implication(s):** Action to insure the sustainability and success of these programs.
- 10) **Theme:** Perceived lack of an overall plan, and of leadership/direction in how the institution moves forward.  
**Implication(s):** A plan needs qualitative/non-financial indicators included.

### 3) Review of the current formal and informal planning processes at Acadia

The following summarizes our review and analysis of existing planning and related processes at Acadia. A summary set of flow charts and timeline is attached as Appendix 1.

- a) **Observation/Findings:** Many of the internal processes used to manage the availability and deployment of resources needed for the execution of academic timetables are not effectively integrated or synchronized at an institutional level. For example, despite the potential for adverse impacts on faculty availability and timetabling of courses, the deadlines for application and consideration of Leave of Absence versus Sabbatical Applications are out of synch.

**Conclusion:** Given the importance of these processes, both for individual faculty and for collective academic planning, and the potential for adverse impacts on in-year planning, synchronization and/or integration of these two (and related) process would improve resource to task allocation for academic planning and timetabling purposes.

- b) **Observation/Findings:** There are several external (e.g., stakeholder) and internal (e.g., budget, fundraising, etc.) processes which appear to interface with academic planning in what can only be described as an ad hoc fashion.

**Conclusion:** Given the interdependencies between resource availability/allocation to the academic sector with regard to the effectiveness of both in-year and forward academic planning, it is considered critical that:

- i) External processes be synchronized with internal processes wherever possible, and
- ii) The interdependencies of internal non-academic sector processes be integrated or synchronized with the academic sector planning processes.

- c) **Observation/Findings:** The interface between regular semester planning/timetabling with Open Acadia intersession planning/timetabling processes is not currently synchronized with other supporting processes.

**Conclusion:** Given the interdependencies of these processes, and the significance of Open Acadia for student progression in particular faculties (e.g., science and business), the current manner in which these are coordinated at the institutional level is considered sub-optimal and needs to be addressed.

- d) **Observation/Findings:** Many of the internal supporting processes (e.g., budgeting, physical infrastructure allocation) which impact academic planning do not appear to have been effectively coordinated at the institutional academic level.

**Conclusion:** Given the critical nature of these processes, in terms of how they enable or constrain academic timetabling/planning, informed, inclusive, and considered coordination is required to effectively support and enhance the academic sector.

- e) **Observation/Findings:** There is a lack of consensual understanding of academic planning processes across the institution.

**Conclusion:** Given the importance of these processes to the academic sector and the institution as a whole, a concerted effort must be made to ensure broad dissemination of academic planning processes across the institution as a whole.

#### **4) Planning practices at other universities**

The Committee conducted an informal survey of various academic institutions in both Canada and the USA to develop a sense of the type of planning processes that were in place at other institutions.

The survey is by no means comprehensive and we did not collect information on how well these processes were perceived to be working at their respective institutions. We were also mindful of the fact that there is a significant difference in the governance models between Canadian and US institutions.

Nevertheless, some common themes did emerge from our work:

- a) Of the (9 Canadian, 5 US) universities surveyed all had a planning committee.
- b) All have fairly broad representation from various sectors.
- c) Most Canadian institutions have the committee primarily as a Senate body, although McMaster is a notable exception.
- d) Some are more focused in the academic sector while some are more pan institutional.
- e) All universities state that they integrate their planning documents on a short and long term basis.
- f) Most universities state that they use their planning documents to evaluate themselves.

A detailed review of practices by institution is attached as Appendix 2.