

Office of the Senate Secretariat

Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia
Canada B0P 1X0

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



Dear Member of Senate:

I advise you that a meeting of the Senate of Acadia University will occur at 4:00 pm on Monday, 19 November 2012 in BAC 132.

The agenda follows:

- 1) Approval of Agenda
- 2) Minutes of the Meeting of 9 October 2012
- 3) Announcements
- 4) Brought forward from 9 October 2012
 - a) Motions re: Discrepancies in Senate Membership (*attached*)
 - b) Budget of the Academic Sector - Acadia's Academic Priorities (*to be circulated*)
- 5) New Business
 - a) Senate Committee Annual Reports (*attached*)
 - i. By-Laws Committee
 - b) Report from the Academic Planning Committee (*attached*)
 - c) Motion from the Senate Curriculum Committee to approve curriculum changes proposed by the School of Computer Science (*attached*)
 - d) Motions from the Senate Chair regarding possible changes to Senate Procedures (*attached*)
- 6) Other Business

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED
Rosemary Jotcham
Registrar and Secretary of Senate

Motions

Whereas the “Report on Senate Membership Discrepancies in the By-laws”, approved by Senate in September 2012, identified multiple discrepancies and problems in the composition of Senate, we present the following Notice of Motions, and recommend that Senate approve these three motions at the November Senate meeting:

1. That the following changes be made to Article II of the Senate Constitution (Membership of Senate):

II. MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Senate of Acadia University shall be as follows: (See Appendix A):

Chair (see Note below) ###

Deputy-Chair (from the Elected Faculty Members of Senate) ** ###

Chancellor

President

Vice-President, Academic

Vice-President, **Enrolment and Student Services** (~~Student Affairs~~)-(non-voting) * +++

Vice President, Administration ~~Chief Financial Officer~~ (non-voting) ****

Dean of Arts

Dean of Professional Studies

Dean of Pure and Applied Science

Dean of Theology

Dean of Research and Graduate Studies ++

Director of Open Acadia

University Librarian

Professional Librarian from among members of the University Community holding appointments as professional librarians. #

Registrar, Secretary to Senate (non-voting)

Student Union President ***** ++++

Twenty-seven members of Faculty, to include nine from each of the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science. This membership shall include one representative from each school.

A member of the Faculty of Theology[#]

Three members of the Board of Governors

Six students, at least one of whom shall be a graduate student^{##}

Three lay persons, nominated by the Senate Nominating Committee who are not eligible for membership under the roles and categories laid out above provided they are not full-time employees of Acadia at the time they are appointed lay members.⁺

Note: The position of Chair is open to ex officio members of Senate, Senators, and Faculty members who are not Senators. Should an ex officio member of Senate be elected as Chairperson, there shall be no adjustment to the composition of Senate; should a Faculty member of Senate be elected as Chairperson, a replacement member shall be elected from the Faculty to which the Chair belongs; should a member from the Faculty at large be elected, there shall be no adjustment to the composition of Senate.

* Changed from Director of Student Services, September 1997

** Added March 1998

*** Amended April 1999; **changed from Chief Financial Officer, November 2012**

**** Added September 1999

+ Amended March 2001

++ Changed from Director of Research & Graduate Studies, February 2002

+++ Changed from Provost, June 2005; **and from Vice-President, Student Affairs, November 2012**

++++ Voting Status Conferred August 2007; **unable to confirm this statement; therefore voting status was affirmed/ reaffirmed by Senate in October 2012.**

Added/Amended September 2007

Changed from “five students...” in September 2007

Amended June 2010

2. That the following changes be made to Appendix A (Membership) of the Senate Constitution.

APPENDIX A - MEMBERSHIP

The current membership of the Senate of Acadia University was established by the Board of Governors on 4 May 1985 acting upon recommendations of the report Into the Fourth Quarter and using the authority granted the Board by Bill 108 of the Nova Scotia Legislature on 1 June 1983. The membership is as follows:

Rec. 7:1 That Senate have 49 members in four categories (**CURRENTLY 57 POSITIONS BECAUSE OF AMENDMENTS; NOTE THAT THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS MAY BE FEWER THAN THE NUMBER OF POSITIONS, DUE TO A SINGLE INDIVIDUAL HOLDING MULTIPLE POSITIONS**):

(a) *Ex officio* members (16) **THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 19 IN MARCH 1998 WITH THE ADDITION OF THE DEPUTY CHAIR; HOWEVER, NOTE THE DEPUTY CHAIR WILL ALSO HOLD A POSITION AS ONE OF THE ELECTED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES.** THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 18 WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF THE PRESIDENT, STUDENT UNION IN SEPTEMBER 1999. THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 17 WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF STUDENT AFFAIRS IN FEBRUARY, 1988

(b) Student members (3) THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 5 BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS IN OCTOBER, 1992. THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 6 BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS IN NOVEMBER 1999.

(c) Lay members (3)

(d) Elected members (27) THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 28 WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY IN MAY 1993, AND TO 29 WITH THE ADDITION OF A PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIAN IN MAY 2007.

7:2 (a) That the *ex officio* members be as follows:

1. The Chancellor
2. The President
3. The Vice-President (Academic)
4. The Vice-President (Administration)

ON 1 JULY 1994 THE TITLE OF THIS POSITION WAS CHANGED TO "VICE-PRESIDENT (FINANCE)". THIS POSITION CHANGED TO CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER AND BECAME A NON-VOTING MEMBER AT THE APRIL 1999 MEETING OF SENATE.

5. The Vice-President (Student Affairs) (non-voting)

AT THE NOVEMBER 2012 MEETING, THE TITLE OF THIS POSITION WAS UPDATED TO “VICE-PRESIDENT, ENROLMENT AND STUDENT SERVICES”.

IN 2004 THE POSITION OF "PROVOST" WAS ELIMINATED AND SENATE APPROVED THE POSITION OF VICE-PRESIDENT (STUDENT AFFAIRS) BE AN EX OFFICIO NON-VOTING MEMBER. IN 1997 THE POSITION OF “DIRECTOR OF STUDENT AFFAIRS” WAS ELIMINATED AND IT WAS RECOMMENDED AND SENATE APPROVED THE POSITION OF “PROVOST” BE AN EX OFFICIO MEMBER.

6. Three members of the Board of Governors

7. The Deans of the Faculties:

- (i) Arts
- (ii) Professional Studies
- (iii) Pure and Applied Science
- (iv) Theology (~~or the Associate Dean~~)

THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THEOLOGY WAS REMOVED AS AN ALTERNATE MEMBER TO THE DEAN OF THEOLOGY AT THE NOVEMBER 2012 MEETING OF SENATE.

8. The Dean of Research and Graduate Studies

9. The Director of Open Acadia

10. The University Librarian

11. The Registrar, who shall be Secretary (non-voting)

12. The Chair

13. The Deputy-Chair

14. The President, Student Union (~~non-voting~~)

THE PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENT UNION WAS GRANTED VOTING STATUS AT THE OCTOBER 2012 MEETING OF SENATE.

- (b) That two students be chosen by or under the auspices of the Student Representative Council and that a third student be a graduate, chosen by the graduate students. AT ITS OCTOBER 1992 MEETING, THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS APPROVED AN INCREASE IN STUDENT MEMBERSHIP ON SENATE TO FIVE STUDENTS. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT OF THESE FIVE STUDENT MEMBERS, ONE SHALL BE A GRADUATE STUDENT SELECTED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE ACADIA GRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION. **THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO SIX STUDENTS IN SEPTEMBER 2007 WITH THE ADDITION OF A STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY. IN NOVEMBER 2012, IT WAS CLARIFIED THAT THE SIX STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES SHALL CONSIST OF FOUR REPRESENTATIVES CHOSEN BY THE SRC; ONE GRADUATE STUDENT CHOSEN BY THE GRADUATE STUDENT ASSOCIATION; AND ONE THEOLOGY STUDENT CHOSEN BY THE ACADIA DIVINITY COLLEGE STUDENT ASSOCIATION IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, OR BY THE DEAN OF THEOLOGY IF THE STUDENT ASSOCIATION IS NOT ABLE TO MAKE AN APPOINTMENT IN A TIMELY FASHION.**
- (c) That there be not more than three lay members of Senate, chosen by Senate.
- (d) That there be twenty-seven members of faculty, nine chosen from each of the Faculties of Arts, Management and Education, and Pure and Applied Science.

THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO TWENTY-EIGHT BY SENATE AT ITS MEETING OF 5 MAY 1993 WHEN IT ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION FROM A SENATE *AD HOC* COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY/DIVINITY COLLEGE RELATIONS (Minute 4 (c) #923--08):

“A member of the Faculty of Theology, chosen by the Faculty, sit as a non-voting member on the Senate of Acadia University; this member shall have voting rights as a delegate of the Principal/Dean when the Principal/Dean is unable to attend the Senate Meeting.” (N.B., As of June 1995, the Board of Governors had not approved the second part of the recommendation, concerning voting rights.)

THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY REPRESENTATIVE WAS GRANTED VOTING STATUS AT THE MAY 2007 MEETING OF SENATE. THIS CHANGE IN STATUS WAS APPROVED BY THE BOARD, AS ANNOUNCED AT THE SEPTEMBER 2007 MEETING OF SENATE.

THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO TWENTY-NINE BY SENATE AT THE MAY 2007 MEETING, WITH THE ADDITION OF A PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIAN, ELECTED BY THE PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS. THIS ADDITION WAS APPROVED BY THE BOARD, AS INDICATED IN THE SEPTEMBER 2007 SENATE MINUTES.

- 7:3 Within the provisions of 7:2 (d) that each School be guaranteed one place on Senate, the appointee to be named by the School concerned and chosen in a manner determined by the individual schools.
- 7:4 That the term of service for senators in the categories listed in 7:1 (c) and (d) above be three years.
- 7:5 That Senate choose annually its own chairman. If an *ex officio* member of Senate is chosen, there shall be no adjustment to the composition of Senate. If an individual is chosen from categories (b), (c) or (d), a replacement shall be chosen. AT ITS MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 1991 SENATE ADOPTED A MOTION THAT THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE BRING FORWARD THE NAME OR NAMES OF PERSONS FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE TO SERVE AS CHAIR. IT WAS NOTED THAT NOMINATIONS FROM THE FLOOR ARE ALSO ACCEPTABLE. AT ITS MEETING OF MARCH 1998 SENATE ADOPTED A MOTION THAT A DEPUTY-CHAIR OF SENATE BE APPOINTED FROM AMONG THE ELECTED FACULTY MEMBERS BY THE SAME PROCEDURE AS THE CHAIR OF THE SENATE.
3. That the following changes be made to Article III, Section 4, of the Senate Constitution (Terms and Duties of Membership).

Four student members of Senate ~~Undergraduate student members of Senate and Senate Committees~~ shall be appointed by the Acadia Students' Representative Council. The term of service shall be the same as that of the SRC which appointed them. **One student member of Senate** ~~Graduate student members of Senate and Senate Committees~~ shall be appointed by the Graduate Students' Association and shall serve a one-year term commencing in September of each year. **One student member of Senate shall normally be appointed by the Acadia Divinity College Student Association, and shall serve a one-year term commencing in September of each year. In the event the Acadia Divinity College Student Association is not able to select a representative in a timely fashion in a given year, the appointment shall be made by the Dean of Theology. Unless otherwise specified, student members of Senate Committees shall be appointed by the Acadia Students' Representative Council.**

Senate By-Laws Committee (SBLC)
Annual Report to Senate
July 2012

Committee Membership:

Dr. Heather A. Kitchin, Faculty of Arts (Chair)
Barbara Anderson, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science (Secretary)
Dr. William Brackney, Faculty of Theology
Dr. Jim MacLeod, Faculty of Professional Studies

The Committee met twice over the 2011/2012 academic year, on February 3, 2012 and June 5, 2012. Meetings were scheduled as matters were referred from Senate. In keeping with its mandate, the Senate By-Laws Committee determined that it would remain advisory and responsive in nature, and to deal with matters as they arose and as referred by Senate.

Senate Chair, Diane Holmberg issued a request that the by-laws committee review the problem of non-staggered committee memberships. The SBLC agreed that this matter fell under the mandate of the Recording Secretary of Senate.

While reviewing Senate documents, Senate Chair, Diane Holmberg discovered various discrepancies in the By-laws related to membership and voting rights. These matters were addressed at the Committee's second meeting, at which time Diane Holmberg and Barbara Anderson agreed to work together on an *ad hoc* basis to review the inconsistencies by the end of August 2012. The results will be addressed in the SBLC's subsequent annual report.

At the second meeting, Senate By-laws Committee agreed that:

- Roles and responsibilities need to be clarified with respect to:
 - whose responsibility it is to update changes to the membership language in the Senate By-laws;
 - the proper process for making these changes;
 - the meaning of the term 'incorporate' in (1) under duties of the By-Laws Committee;
 - procedures involving the SBLC in relation to incorporating changes to the Constitution.
- The timing for conducting a review of the By-laws of Senate should be considered; the SBLC recommended this be in 2012-13. It was agreed that it would be helpful to have:
 - clearer language on policy and procedures for each Standing Committee member;
 - a more detailed description of the roles and responsibilities of the Senate Chair;
 - a review of Senate Standing Committees, their mandates, memberships and whether possible to eliminate or collapse some of the committees.

Over 2012-13, the SBLC will work towards developing a work plan to begin addressing the above matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather A. Kitchin, Chair

Interim Report of the Senate Academic Planning Committee

November 6, 2012

The Academic Planning Committee (APC), comprising Drs. Barry Moody, Heather Hemming, Peter Williams, David McMullin, Terrance Weatherbee, David Duke, Tom Herman and Mr. Kyle Power, has met twice to date (September 19 and October 24, 2012).

September 19, 2012

At its inaugural meeting (September 19), the Chair provided a brief review of the activities and outcomes of the 2011-12 *Ad hoc* Academic Planning & Priorities Committee (AP&PC) and shared some general thoughts on the purpose of the APC and the importance of engaging the broader campus community. He also reminded members of the pre-eminence of the institutional good in the Committee's deliberations and that all members represent the entire academic sector of Acadia University rather than individual Faculties.

The defined mandate of the APC is "to make recommendations to Senate on matters relating to academic principles and planning. In carrying out its work, the APC shall consult widely with all stakeholders and relevant bodies on campus. The APC shall report regularly to Senate, no less than two times per year."

Committee members agreed that as an over-arching principle, the APC should be consultative and transparent. Due to its relatively small size, it was agreed that informal and open discussion would be encouraged and would not impede efficient operation of the Committee.

The following meeting schedule was confirmed:

Wednesday, October 24 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. KCIC Meeting Room
Wednesday, November 24 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, December 19 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, January 23 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, February 13 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, March 27 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, April 24 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, May 22 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom

The Committee discussed transitioning from the AP&PC to the APC, acknowledging the expectation that the APC would both explore and construct a planning process and consider for recommendation potential changes to the existing academic structure.

The APC acknowledged that the AP&PC had identified the need for improving both integration and communication of existing academic planning, recognizing that issues of resource allocation and of planning are occasionally confused or conflated. T. Weatherbee spoke to the "Start-up Activity Agenda" which was previously recommended and approved by Senate. The Agenda was crafted by a sub-committee of the AP&PC charged with exploring the extent of linkages among current academic processes at Acadia, and best practices at other academic institutions. Their analysis noted that the existing suite of deadlines for processes on campus did not facilitate planning in academic units.

In shaping its activities and approach going forward, the APC reflected on the challenges faced by the previous AP&PC, noting that it was hindered by its large size and lack of a clearly established mandate. The APC agreed that it has the opportunity to identify useful non-threatening processes that would improve life on campus. It also agreed that it is crucial that this committee make tangible recommendations to Senate for its consideration, and that it recognize current constraints to resource allocation.

The Committee also discussed its potential relationship with the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) and agreed that information flow between the two is critical, with the APRC providing “small p” planning, and sharing its recommendations for review by the APC if they impacted on the “big P” planning of the APC. It was recognized that, like the APRC, the APC is advisory and informative, with the capacity to make recommendations to Senate, which is the final arbiter of academic planning.

The inaugural meeting closed with identification of several key areas for further discussion:

1. Revisiting and restatement of Acadia’s key values, and mechanisms for incorporating those values into our planning;
2. Identification of Acadia’s optimal capacity;
3. Exploration of “end states” for enrolment, including quotas;
4. Insuring sustainability of small programs;
5. Insuring integrity of large programs;
6. Assessing existing unit structures.

Several specific items were identified for the October meeting of the APC:

1. Outline the APC’s activities and its relationship to Senate. (T. Weatherbee agreed to prepare a 3-4 page document for modification and approval by the committee prior to it going to Senate);
2. Begin to articulate a process for improving support for inter/trans-disciplinary programs.
3. Begin to pursue and restate the value of a Liberal Arts education, with first step to define “end state”.
4. Identify the nature and structure of community consultation (e.g. unsolicited vs. solicited discussion papers)

October 24, 2012

In its October 24 meeting the APC discussed the “Proposed Academic Planning Committee Planning Framework” document prepared by T. Weatherbee (TW). TW provided an overview of the document, suggesting that the key role of a committee such as this is to “plan for the planning” rather than do the actual planning itself. The structures and processes outlined in the document are standard planning frameworks that are employed in business and elsewhere when planning complex activities. It breaks down those complexities into simple, but synchronised, building blocks that can be tackled independently but in an integrated format.

The initial and key stage of the process is to define an achievable end-state and aim at that. The end-state operates at multiple levels, from a macro-focus (e.g., the inter-relationship between the faculties in the learning process) down to mid- or narrow-focus (e.g., which courses in Arts should be available for a Science student, and so on). External shocks can have both positive and negative effects on the desired end-state. The planning process can accommodate such shocks (a) in the negative environment by producing a set of robust values that are relatively immune to constraints and (b) in the positive environment not by altering the scope of the end-state but by altering its

timeline. This kind of robust planning environment is, by definition, preferable to short-term, often ad hoc and responsive crisis management. The flexibility and scope of the planning structure allow one to adapt to new environments by recognising the impact of those new environments (new costs, new opportunities) across the board.

Discussion ensued regarding the Strategic Plan (SP) as an element that could be incorporated into the Academic Planning Process. The point was made that the SP does in fact contain an end state that could be used as an achievable goal of the planning process. The discussion then moved to the end state of the planning process itself and the SP. From AP&PC work, we have unit-response data on how units see their programs within the SP mission statement, especially in the provision of a sustainable liberal-based education.

The Committee briefly reviewed the Values and Mission sections of the SP and then focused on the "Acadia Education" section of the SP (pp. 4-5), which describes explicit components of the educational process at Acadia. The Committee discussed and recognized the relevance of the existing components that comprise the "Acadia Education", suggesting the possible modification of the fourth component (on environment and social issues), and the addition of a sixth – Community Engagement, which has in recent years become central to the Institution's activities, academic and otherwise.

In preparation for the November APC meeting, a sub-committee of P. Williams, D. McMullin and D. Duke agreed to prepare a summary end state document, and all members were charged with generating thematic lines along which planning processes could be developed.

A brief general discussion of interdisciplinary / transdisciplinary program delivery and resourcing followed, concluding with the arrival of the Chair of Senate, Dr. Holmberg, and a shift in discussion to cooperation on planning issues between Senate and the Board of Governors.

Respectfully submitted,
Tom Herman, Chair

Motion:

The Senate Curriculum Committee moves that the modifications to the Bachelor of Computer Science with Specialization be approved by Senate.

Department/School: **Jodrey School of Computer Science**

Acadia University Senate Curriculum Committee 2011-2012
Form 4: Proposed Modification to a program

Presented to Faculty Council? Yes, presented and passed at the April 25, 2012 meeting of the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science.

Briefly (in one paragraph) outline the nature of the changes you are requesting to your program. Modification brought to Bachelor of Computer Science with Specialization see p. 70 of Calendar

1.

There are three changes:

- COMP 3403 (Analysis of Algorithms) and COMP 3703 (Translators) are removed as required courses from our Specializations.
- A new Software Development program replaces the E-Commerce program as a more general program about developing desk-top and web-centric systems.
- Two Psychology courses are removed from the Mobile and Ubiquitous Computing specialization and COMP 4343 (Networks and Distributed Systems) is added as a required course.

2. Briefly state the reason for requesting this modification. Please be specific.

The reasons for each of the changes:

- Many universities offer industry focused software development (with less theory) as well as the more traditional computer science degrees (where theory remains an important requirement). The removal of the two theory courses from the general specialization requirements will make these programs attractive to a large range of students by giving them greater flexibility in course selection from the School and across Acadia. Students can still optionally take COMP 3403 and 3703.
- The new Software Development program places greater emphasis on software systems analysis, design and integration, as well as development methodologies, team work, interpersonal communications, and project management skills. The largest percentage growth in the ICT sector is expected in software development (35% increase from 2011-2016).
- The material on usability in the two Psychology courses is sufficiently covered in our HCI course. COMP 4343 (Networks and Distributed Systems) is an important requirement for this particular specialization.

3. Will the modification alter, in any substantive way, the way your program is currently delivered?
Yes No
If you checked no, please proceed to question 7. If you checked yes, briefly state how the modification will change the nature of your program.
4. Has the proposed modification been discussed with students?
Yes No
5. Do students approve of the modification?
Yes No
6. Are the effects of this program change restricted to your own Department/School?
Yes No
If you checked No to any of the questions 4-6 above, please explain your answer(s).
7. Indicate the exact changes you want made to the existing program description in University Calendar. We recommend typing in the relevant sections of the current calendar, and indicating deletions to the existing description with strikeouts and additions to the existing description with bold type. (*Preferably do this in WORD and use the Track Changes feature on the Tools Menu. However, any system that clearly indicates what changes are needed is acceptable.*)

Bachelor of Computer Science with Specialization

1. Comp 1113, 1123, 2103, 2113, 2203, 2213, 2663, 2903, 3343, ~~3403~~, 3613, 3663, ~~3703~~, 3713, 3753, 4983, and Math 1413 or 1313, and 1323 or 1333, each with C- or better (48h)
2. A set of required specialty courses, each completed with a grade of C- or better. The specialties and their required courses, are:

~~**Electronic Commerce:** Comp 2513, 2523, 3503, (9h from Comp 3513, 3583, 4343, or 4583), Busi 1703, 2213, 2413, 2053, 3h other Busi, Comm 1213 (36h); 15h Busi.~~

Software Development: Comp 2513, 3513, 3583, 3773; Comm 1213; 12h from the School of Business Administration; 9h with permission of the school. (36h);

Game Development: Comp 3553, 3583, 3773, 4343, 4613, 4553, Math 2313, ~~Comp 4983~~. Plus 15h with permission of the school (36h);

Mobile and Ubiquitous Computing: Comp 2513, 2523, 3583, **4343**, 4583; Psyc 1013, 1023, 2143; ~~2013; (Psyc 2023 or 2143)~~; plus 12h with permission of the School (36h).

3. Math 1013, 1023, 2233, each with C- or better (9h)
 4. 6h selected from English, Art at the 1000-level, Classics, Comparative Religion, a single language other than English, History, Music (not applied, vocal or instrumental methods, or practical studies), Philosophy, Theology (Theo 3013/23, Bibl 2013/23, Gree 3013/23), Women's and Gender Studies “or Comm 1213 and 1223 (if specialization is not Software Development)”.
 5. 9h of courses from the Faculty of Arts (not Econ 2613, 2623, or Soci 3103).
 6. ~~6h of non-computer science courses~~ 12h of electives with at most 6h in Comp
 7. A minimum CGPA of 2.00 is required to be eligible to graduate.
 8. The Comp 4983 project must be in the area of the specialization.
-
8. Will this program change the result in the addition of any new courses?
Yes No
If yes, please list all new course numbers below, and fill out Form 2 (New Course Proposal) for each.
 9. Will this program change result in the deletion of any existing courses?
Yes No
If yes, please list all deleted course numbers below, and fill out Form 2 (Proposed Course Deletion) for each.
 10. Will this program change result in substantive modifications to any existing courses?
Yes No
If yes, please list all affected course numbers below, and fill out Form 3 (Proposed Course Modification) for each.
 11. Other relevant information.

**Motions Regarding Senate Procedures,
for Senate's Consideration**

General Disclaimer: These motions represent suggestions people have made to me regarding possible changes to Senate procedures. I wish to make it clear that although I am bringing forward these motions for Senate's consideration, as Chair I am not advocating either position (i.e., supporting or defeating these motions), and I will personally abstain from all votes on these motions. There are always advantages and disadvantages to any approach; were I a Senator voting on these motions, I would weigh the pros and cons, and no doubt end up supporting some of these motions and opposing others. As Chair, though, I am simply trying to find the proper balance between encouraging full and open debate and discussion, while also dealing relatively efficiently with the business at hand and getting to all agenda items in a timely fashion. I am perfectly happy to go either way on each of these issues, according to the preference of the majority of Senators.

Motion #1, Regarding Senate Attendance

Background: There is a rule in the Senate Constitution regarding attendance at Senate that has not been enforced in recent memory, to my knowledge or the knowledge of others on Senate Executive. It seems pointless to have a rule on the books that is not observed, but I am reluctant to make a unilateral decision to begin enforcing the rule, thereby going against years of past practice. I am looking for Senate's guidance as to whether I should begin enforcing this rule. If Senate prefers not to enforce the rule (i.e., this motion is defeated), then I would recommend removing the rule from the Constitution, and I will bring forward a Notice of Motion next month to amend the Constitution accordingly.

Motion: That the Chair shall enforce the following rule in the Senate Constitution (Part III, point 5): "If any elected or appointed member of Senate, other than ex officio members, misses three consecutive regular meetings, that member's seat shall be declared vacant and shall be filled by recourse to the appropriate electoral or appointment procedure." To give fair warning, counts of absences shall begin at the November meeting.

Motion #2, Regarding Usual Length of Announcements

Background: Some Senators have noted that the amount of time devoted to announcements seems to be increasing. It will often be half or even $\frac{3}{4}$ of an hour into the meeting before we finish announcements and start in on the main agenda. That is frequently because people have questions; also, the questions are sometimes on other matters, not directly related to the announcements that have been made. Announcements seem to be evolving into a sort of "Question Period". The advantage is that it provides a monthly public forum for Senators to ask senior administrators timely questions on a wide variety of topics. The disadvantage is that considerable time may be devoted to questions of interest to only a few, at the cost of not getting to the main agenda items. This motion and the next one represent suggestions I have received to focus the announcement period; however, if Senators prefer the current open-ended Q & A approach, they can defeat these motions and we will continue with the status quo. Note I am going with a 5-minute time limit per speaker as that was the suggestion I received; the motion could certainly be amended to represent a longer time for some or all speakers, if desired.

Motion: That the Chair shall enforce a standing special order to limit announcements to five minutes per speaker (including time for questions).

Note: A “standing special order” would mean that would be the default time; however, it could always be extended if needed. If those making announcements know in advance that they will need more time in a given month, they can ask for additional time, which will be noted and approved as part of the agenda. Under normal circumstances, however, the Chair would stop the announcement period when five minutes are up. If the speaker is almost done, the Chair can ask if there are any objections to extending the time briefly, and will do so if there are no objections. If considerably more time should turn out to be needed, any Senator (including the announcer) could move to extend the debate, and if 2/3 of Senators agree, additional time can be allotted.

Motion #3, Regarding Questions during Announcements

Background: During debate on motions, all statements must be germane to the topic at hand; i.e., you cannot bring up issues that are unrelated to the motion that is currently being discussed. If speakers do so, the Chair rules them out of order, and the speaker must wait until the appropriate time to make their statement. I have not been enforcing such a rule during announcements; instead, I have been allowing any questions that Senators wish to pose, whether related to the announcements or not. If a majority of Senators so wished, however, questions could be restricted to those germane to the announcements that have been made.

Motion: That the Chair shall rule questions that are not germane to the topic(s) of a speaker’s announcements as being out of order.

Note: Senators who know in advance that they want to bring up a particular topic/issue in a given meeting are always free to put that issue on the agenda, either as a motion or as a discussion item, and have it approved as part of the regular agenda. If an issue should arise during the course of a meeting, any Senator is also free to make a motion to add a topic/issue to the agenda (note that revising an agenda after it has already been approved requires 2/3 majority approval; note also that adding motions to an agenda on the day they will be voted on requires the approval of a majority of the entire membership, in order to waive Notice of Motion). Therefore, if a question is ruled not germane, it can always be added to the agenda as a new item; it simply requires a majority or 2/3 of Senators, as appropriate, to agree that they wish to devote Senate time to that particular topic.

Motion #4, Regarding Vetting of the Wording of Recommendations or Motions

Background: Individuals or committees sometimes bring forward motions that are unclear. They also sometimes bring forward recommendations to Senate that are not in the form of motions, so that it is not clear what Senate is actually being asked to do to enact the recommendation. A great deal of time can be spent on the floor of Senate word-smithing motions, or trying to turn recommendations into concrete motions that can be voted upon. If items came to Senate in “motion-ready” form, it would likely save a great deal of everybody’s time.

Motion: That individuals or committees bringing motions or recommendations to Senate will consult with the Deputy Chair or the Chair first, to make sure the wording is clear.

Note: In general, individuals or committees making recommendations to Senate would be asked to reframe them as motions, making it clear what specific action they are asking Senate to take. Motions would be vetted only for clarity of wording, not for content. If movers did not agree with the suggestions made by the Deputy Chair or Chair, they could still bring forward their unrevised motion, but while speaking to it, should mention that the Deputy Chair / Chair made certain recommendations for wording changes, which they chose not to incorporate for such-and-such a reason. If the majority of Senators agree with the mover, the mover's wording will stand; if the majority prefers the wording suggested by the Deputy Chair / Chair, it could be incorporated as an amendment without having to re-craft the wording from scratch.

Motion #5, Regarding Alternating Pro and Con Views during Debates

Background: Occasionally, Senate will spend quite some time discussing an issue, even though all or almost all of the discussion is on one side of the issue. To make sure that key points on both sides of the debate emerge as early in the discussion as possible, Robert's (p. 379) recommends that "In cases where the chair knows that persons seeking the floor have opposite opinions on the question... the chair should let the floor alternate, as far as possible, between those favouring and those opposing the measure. In large assemblies, various devices are sometimes used to assist the chair in following this rule, such as having members seeking recognition hold up cards of different colors, go to different microphones 'for' or 'against', or the like." Senate has never followed this procedure, to my knowledge, but it is a possibility.

Motion: That during debate, the Chair, as much as possible, alternates speaking turns between those in favour of a motion and those opposed to a motion.

Note: We would have to come up with a system to make this procedure work, but it would be do-able. We would need some kind of a signal as to whether people wishing to get onto the speaker's list are for or against the motion (e.g., left hand up vs. right hand; one finger raised vs. two fingers raised; different coloured cards to hold up, if those systems don't work well). I would then simply maintain two speakers' lists, and alternate back and forth between them whenever there are speakers on both lists. The advantage to this procedure is that it gets ideas on both sides of the debate out quickly and efficiently. Also, if it becomes clear that no one has anything to say against a motion, for example, then Senators might decide to move to a vote early on, without spending time belabouring a point on which all agree. The disadvantage to this procedure is that it might lead people to choose sides too quickly, or terminate debate prematurely, without giving the discussion full opportunity to evolve.