Office of the Senate Secretariat

Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia
Canada B0P 1X0

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

ACADIA
UNIVERSITY

Dear Member of Senate:

I advise you that a meeting of the Senate of Acadia University will occur at **4:00 p.m.** on Tuesday 13th October, 2015 in **BAC 132**.

The agenda follows:

1) Approval of Agenda

2) Minutes of the Meeting of 14th September, 2015

3) Announcements *(normally 10 minutes per speaker)*

4) Time sensitive items

   a)   Approval of Graduates
      i. Approval of list *(to be circulated)*
      ii. Enabling motion *(attached)*

5) New Business

   a) 2015-2016 Enrolment Report (S. Mesheau/J. Banks)
   b) Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee 2015-16 report and discussion *(attached)*
   c) Academic Integrity Committee report from 2014-15, report for 2015-16 and discussion document (D. Holmberg) *(attached)*
   d) VPA report on Budget Actuals 2014-2015 (R. Perrins) *(to be circulated)*

   e) Reports from Senate sub-committees:

      i)   Senate Executive Committee report to Senate *(attached)*
      ii)   Academic Planning Committee report to Senate *(to be circulated)*
      iii)   Faculty Development Committee report to Senate *(attached)*
      iv)   Curriculum Committee report to Senate *(to be circulated)*
      v)   By-laws Committee report to Senate *(to be circulated)*
      vi)   Admission & Academic Standing (Appeals) report to Senate *(to be circulated)*
      vii)   Admission & Academic Standing (Policy) report to Senate *(to be circulated)*
      viii)   Archives Committee report to Senate *(to be circulated)*
      ix)   Awards Committee report to Senate *(attached)*
      x)   Academic Program Review Committee report to Senate *(to be circulated)*

1

xi)   Board of Open Acadia report to Senate (*to be circulated*)
xii)   Graduate Studies Committee report to Senate (*attached*)
xiii) Honours Committee report to Senate (*attached*)
xiv)   Library Committee report to Senate (*attached*)
xv)   Nominating Committee report to Senate (*attached*)
xvi)   Research Ethics Board (*attached*)
xvii) Research Committee report to Senate (*attached*)
xviii) T.I.E. Committee report to Senate (*attached*)

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED
Rosie Hare
Recording Secretary to Senate

Enabling Motion

Any candidate for an Acadia degree, diploma or certificate who should receive a grade or otherwise qualify or be disqualified between this Senate meeting and the Senate meeting in April, may, if circumstances require, be considered by the Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee, the appropriate Dean, the appropriate Head/Director, and the Registrar, acting as an ad hoc committee of Senate, they having the power to make consequential amendments to the graduation list. Any such amendments to the list shall be reported to Senate at the next Senate meeting.

ACADIA UNIVERSITY

Report of the SCHOLARSHIPS, PRIZES AND AWARDS COMMITTEE (SPAC) to SENATE

REPORT DATE: September 30, 2015

SPAC COMMITTEE CHAIR
Scott Landry will chair the committee to June 2016.

MEETINGS DATES
The committee will meet in person and via email.

The committee met in person on September 29, 2015.
Additional meetings for the 2015-2016 year are expected to be held in:
November 2015
Early March 2016
April 2016

Several other meetings may be held between the SPAC Chair, Secretary, and Manager of Scholarships & Financial Assistance to decide upon various awards and matters as needed.

The Bursary & Loan Committee of SPAC will meet weekly throughout the academic year as needed. Two meetings have already been held.

PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE
The committee will be reviewing the purpose and duties as listed below at the November meeting.

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont
Secretary

Scott Landry
Chair

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE
Annual Report to Senate for 2014-2015
April 29, 2015
Committee Members 2014-2015
Dr. Susan Potter (Chair), Pure & Applied Science
Mr. Derek Serafini, Registrar
Dr. Stephen Ahern, Arts
Dr. Jason Holt, Professional Studies
Ms. Pat Townsend (Sept – Dec, 2014), Ms. Anne Smith (Jan – Apr, 2015), Library
Mr. Connor Thompson, student representative

In October, 2014, Derek Serafini reported that the committee would focus on the following this year:

1. A review of Senate's current academic integrity policy and processes (i.e., does anything need to be updated or changed?).
2. A review of Senate's academic integrity policy and processes vis-à-vis faculty- and department-specific policies (i.e., are there differences in how infractions are penalized across departments, schools, and faculties? Are expectations and penalties clear to students?).
3. A review of the central registry of infractions (do we need to start collecting additional data points? How should we use the data we collect? How and to whom and when should the data be reported?, etc.).

The Academic Integrity Committee met three times: October 2, October 31, and February 13. We made good progress on the tasks outlined above.

Item #1 was focus of discussion in all three meetings. There was disagreement among members of the Academic Integrity Committee with respect to whether the current policy was fine or in need of revision. One of the main issues of contention was how to address the wide range of consequences that are imposed by different professors and departments for similar infractions (e.g., from "don't do it again" to a grade of zero on the test or assignment) while at the same time protecting academic freedom. In examining this issue, the academic integrity policies of other NS universities as well as primarily undergraduate universities in other provinces were reviewed. Many universities have policies that are more detailed and specific than Acadia's although others are similar. The committee could not reach a consensus with respect to whether or not to revise the current policy. The importance of educating students about academic integrity was discussed and it was noted that the library has some excellent resources including an award-winning video designed to explain different forms of cheating and plagiarism, but it is not known how many students are aware of these resources. Encouraging the use of plagiarism software/websites such as Turn-it-in was also discussed. During the last meeting there was discussion about the possibility of developing guidelines to assist professors and departments in dealing with academic integrity violations, including suggested penalties and reporting procedures, without turning the guidelines into formal policy. This topic is complex and the committee plans to continue to work on it.

In addressing item #2, the Chair of the Academic Integrity Committee contacted all department heads and asked for any policies/guidelines they have for dealing with student infractions. Based on the information collected, each department handles infractions differently. Some departments have written documents that outline specific penalties and are included with course outlines, others have

informal policies, and many have no policy; in most cases, academic integrity violations are handled by individual faculty in their own courses. The student representative on the committee felt that in many cases, penalties are not clear to students.

With respect to item #3, the central registry of infractions is currently held by the office of the registrar. When an academic integrity infraction is reported to the registrar, the incident is documented and the student's name is added to the list. When a student commits an infraction, in determining what penalty to impose, professors/departments can check to see if that student has committed previous infractions. The Academic Integrity Committee continues to discuss how to address the questions regarding the documentation of academic integrity infractions.

Respectfully submitted by Susan Potter, Chair

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE

Plans for 2015-2016

October 5, 2015

Committee Members 2015-2016

Dr. Susan Potter (Chair), Pure & Applied Science
Dr. Jeff Banks, Acting Registrar
Dr. Stephen Ahern, Arts
Dr. Jason Holt, Professional Studies
Dr. Paul Arnold, Engineering
Ms. Anne Smith, University Librarian (Acting)
Ms. Carlie Visser, student representative

The Academic Integrity Committee held its first meeting of the fall term on October 5th, 2015.

There have been some changes in the membership since the last meeting. New members include: Jeff Banks. Acting Registrar (replacing Derek Serafini), Paul Arnold, and Carlie Visser, student representative (replacing Connor Thompson). New members were apprised of the current state of discussion and progress with respect to the issues the committee has been actively engaged in addressing over the past year. The questions that the committee will focus on this year include:

1. How can the current academic integrity policy be improved (in terms of the way infractions are penalized, the communication of expectations and penalties to students, for example) without infringing on academic freedom?

2. Further review of the central registry of infractions; consider developing a policy regarding the registry taking into consideration factors such as FOIPOP legislation.

The committee will attempt to meet at least twice each term; more meetings will be scheduled as needed.

Respectfully submitted by Susan Potter, Chair

Background / Context Information for Academic Integrity Discussion at Senate

Disclaimer: This information was prepared by D. Holmberg, and the contents might reflect her own personal biases. Others are most definitely welcome and encouraged to add further information and differing perspectives during the Senate discussion!

Background / Context

- Acadia University's current Academic Integrity Policy appears on page 53 of the 2015-2016 Academic calendar, available on-line here: http://registrar.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/registrar/pdfs/Academic_Calendars/calendar_final.pdf . Senators are encouraged to bring a copy of this current policy to the Senate meeting, for reference.
- The policy has not been changed in any substantive way (i.e., anything other than minor wording or formatting changes) since 2004/2005.
- There were apparently some proposed changes discussed in 2009. The committee revised the policy and circulated it to Senate; it was discussed at length and received feedback (see the May 2009 minutes, available here: http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/senate/Minutes/2008/13Apr09.pdf). However, the proposed changes do not seem to have ever been voted on or incorporated into the calendar, although some aspects (e.g., the Registrar maintaining a record of offenses) have been implemented in practice, without being explicitly noted in the policy.
- After that, the Academic Integrity Committee seems to have stopped meeting / functioning for a number of years. There were no further annual reports to Senate until October 2012 (see http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/senate/Minutes/2012/9Oct2012.pdf). At that meeting, the committee recommended they be disbanded, stating that: (a) input from unit heads showed that units had appropriate procedures in place to deal with academic integrity that fit their discipline; (b) the Registrar circulates information to all faculty members each fall reminding them of the importance of the issue, and the appropriate procedures; (c) any further issues or concerns could be addressed by the Admissions and Academic Standing (Policy) Committee. Some Senators expressed concern, and did not feel the committee should be disbanded. No further action to disband the committee was taken.
- The committee has met several times in the last two years. According to the Chair (S. Potter), there was a difference of opinion amongst committee members, with some thinking the current system is perfectly fine, allowing maximum flexibility and academic freedom. Other committee members saw problems with the current system and wanted to review it. The committee was unable to reach consensus as to whether a review should be undertaken. They did contact unit heads and found that most units did not have any policies beyond what is stated in the University calendar (there are exceptions, and some profs may have individual policies).

Potential Concerns

Again, please note that some faculty members like the system exactly as is, so these concerns are not shared by all. However, some concerns with the current policy have been noted:

- The current policy is not very specific regarding what does and does not constitute cheating and plagiarism. Students often report, apparently with full sincerity, that they did not realize a certain behavior was problematic, and that they had engaged in it before in many other classes with no problem. Other institutions spell out much more fully on their websites exactly what constitutes a violation. The Library does have some excellent tutorials; students can be encouraged to take these, but there is currently no way to document whether or not they have done so.

- In a related vein, deciding what constitutes a violation of the policy, whether a violation has occurred in a particular instance, and what the appropriate punishment should be, is largely left up to individual instructors. Different rules can apply in different courses, and very different penalties might be applied for identical offences. Other institutions have committees that review the evidence presented, and determine the appropriate punishment, according to institutional guidelines.

- In determining appropriate penalties, some faculty members like to know if the student has a record of previous offences. If offences are reported to the Registrar's Office, they do keep a record, and will report the details of any previous offences at a faculty member's request. However, students are not always informed of the existence of this record, and there are no clear guidelines regarding who has access to it. Current practices might very well violate FOIPOP guidelines.

- If students are unhappy with a faculty member's decision in a particular instance, they have the right to appeal the issue to the head/director, the Dean, the VPA, and the Senate Committee on Academic Discipline. Any of these bodies can overturn the faculty member's decision, and elect to apply a different penalty, or none at all. There is then no recourse for faculty members to appeal at any stage, if they disagree with the decisions of those bodies. This lack of an appeal process can potentially lead to threats to academic freedom, if professors have their best judgement overturned, with no possibility of recourse.

Next Steps?

- Senate might decide the current policy is perfectly fine as is and no review is needed.
- Senate could request the committee review the policy in light of these concerns and others, and recommend changes.
- These recommendations might come in the form of a standard university policy; a default university policy that would apply unless professors spelled out any exceptions clearly on their course outlines; or a requirement that all professors should clearly spell out their own personal policies on their course outlines (with appropriate support from higher levels, if the evidence supports that students have violated a policy that was clearly articulated on the course outline).

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT TO SENATE

October 5th, 2015

The Senate Executive Committee met on Monday September 28, 2015. This committee will meet again on the following dates: November 23, 2015; January 25, 2016 and April 13, 2016. The most significant mandates of the committee, according to the Senate constitution, is "to consider matters that in its judgment call for senatorial action" and "to consider matters referred to it by Senate." At our meeting on September 28 we identified the planning and monitoring of initiatives following from the Senate Executive White Paper (i.e. discussion and action on the Senate endorsed list of potential topics for consideration 2015/2016) to be the central work of Senate Executive for this year.

Ann Vibert

Senate and Senate Executive Chair

Report from the Faculty Development Committee (FDC), October 2015

Since our last report to Senate (May, 2015), we have had a change in membership. Jonathon Fowles (Prof. St.) was replaced by Ann Dodge and Danny Zacharias (Theology) has yet to be replaced. The Faculty Development Committee has had three in-person meetings-one in June and two in September. We also had a number of discussions over email during the summer. In September, Lisa Price agreed to continue serving as Chair of the committee for either the 2015-2016 year or until the Faculty Support Committee is created. The FDC has agreed on three goals. First, we agreed to continue organizing workshops during the study breaks in October and February to support teaching excellence at Acadia. The upcoming workshop on October 13th, 2015 will include a presentation on gender bias in academia from Randy Newman, Psychology, and a presentation on blended learning by Sharon Churchill and Susanne Campbell, Open Acadia. We will be providing certificates of attendance to faculty who attend the workshop.

Second, we have agreed to continue working with the Deans and the Associated Alumni of Acadia University (AAAU) to harmonize the existing Teaching Awards in each of the three faculties. L. Price met with a representative of the AAAU (Oonagh Proudfoot) in September to discuss the AAAU teaching award. The winner of the AAAU award will be selected from recipients of the teaching awards from each of the three faculties. The winner of that award will be announced at convocation in May and nominated for an Association of Atlantic Universities Teaching Award.

The third goal of the FDC is to work with the Academic Technologies Committee to create the Faculty Support Committee. Over the summer, L. Price had a number of meetings with Barb Anderson (former Chair, By-Laws Committee), Jim MacLeod (Prof. Studies rep., By-Laws Committee), and Jeff Banks (Chair, Academic Technologies Committee) to discuss the merger of the Faculty Development Committee and the Academic Technologies Committee into the Faculty Support Committee (Motion passed by Senate in April 2105). A number of members of both committees met on Sept. 8th to discuss the possible mission statement and committee membership. Based on those discussions, L. Price created a draft of the mission statement and membership and sent it to all members of both committees for feedback. We have received that feedback and are now looking for guidance as to how to proceed.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Price, Chair

ACADIA
U N I V E R S I T Y
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

TO: Dr. Ann Vibert, Chair of Senate

FROM: Raymond E. Ivany, Chair of the Awards Committee

SUBJECT: Awards Committee

DATE: October 2, 2015

Senators:

The Awards Committee operates on a regular cycle of soliciting nominations for honorary degrees, accepting nominations for Emeriti awards followed by evaluation of the nominees and finally, providing recommendations to Senate. The 2015-16 cycle began with a committee meeting on October 1st to plan and set goals for the year. The committee issued a public call for honorary degree nominations to the Acadia Community on October 1st.

In addition to the above, the Awards Committee has one outstanding policy issue (eligibility of Instructors for Emeriti recognition) that will be considered at our next meeting.

I trust the above information serves to update Senate on the status of the Awards Committee.

Respectfully,

Ray

Senate Committee on Graduate Studies

Interim Report to Senate – October 2015

The Senate Committee on Graduate Studies held its open meeting on September 30th. The agenda for this meeting included an overview of roles and responsibilities, a discussion of various administrative issues, and the identification of two primary objectives for the 2015-2016 academic year:

• A quality standards framework for graduate studies at Acadia
• A possible recruitment strategy for graduate studies at Acadia

Subcommittees are being struck to (a) address current administrative issues related to graduate student registration and thesis defenses, and (b) to adjudicate the various awards (e.g., Gold Medal, Tri-Council; NSHRF; Provincial Scholarships). The discussion of quality standards is tentatively planned for a December retreat.

Current membership:

David MacKinnon	Chair; Research & Graduate Studies
Susan Potter	Psychology
Mark Mallory	Biology
Andre Trudel	Computer Science
Pat Rigg	English
Lynn Aylward	Education (Ph.D. program)
Gregg MacKinnon	Education (M.Ed. program)
Rachel Brickner	Politics
John Colton	Community Development
Zelda Abramson	Sociology
Wilson Lu	Mathematics & Statistics
Sandra Barr	Geology
Sherri McFarland	Chemistry
Bill Brackney	Theology
Ian Spooner	Applied Geomatics
Geoffrey Whitehall	Social & Political Thought
Christine Anderson	Graduate Student – Pure & Applied Science
TBA	Graduate Student – Arts
TBA	Graduate Student – Professional Studies
TBA	Graduate Student – Theology

Submitted by:

David MacKinnon
Chair

Senate Honours Committee

Interim Report to Senate – October, 2015

The Senate Honours Committee will hold its opening meeting on Friday, October 9th, to establish its agenda for the year. The first order of business will be to select a Chair.

Current membership:

David MacKinnon	Research & Graduate Studies (*ex officio*)
Jeff Banks	Interim Registrar (*ex officio*)
Marc Ramsay	Philosophy
Cynthia Alexander	Politics
Chris Shields	Kinesiology
Jun Yang	Business
Jeff Hooper	Mathematics & Statistics
Anna Redden	Biology
Liam Murphy	Honours student (Arts)
Maya Basa	Honours student (Professional Studies)
Rylee Oosterhuis	Honours student (Pure & Applied Science)

Submitted by:

David MacKinnon
Transition Chair

Senate Committee on the Library
October 2, 2015

As requested, the Committee held an initial meeting on October 1 to review its mandate and set goals for the year. We heard a report updating the work of the Library since June. Kelly Bennett was designate secretary to the Committee.

We agreed to review our mandate thoroughly and we designated a sub-committee to report by our February meeting. Concerns include our advocacy and policymaking roles. The sub-committee includes library professional staff and department representatives.

At a meeting planned for early December, we agreed to have a full discussion of the Open Access Policy and in February we will review our Research Data Management Policy.

We continue to affirm the importance of a Senate Committee on the Library.

We also expressed concern for the appointment of a permanent University Librarian before the term of the Interim UL expires.

Respectfully for the Committee,

William Brackney, Chair

Transition Chair's Report – Senate Nominating Committee

The senate nominating committee for 2015-16 (consisting of consisting of Ian Hutchinson, Eva Curry, Romira Worvill, Ana Saroli, David Piper, Andrew Mitchell and Ray Ivany) met on Monday, September 28th 2015 to elect a chair for the upcoming year and review our goals and priorities. Andrew Mitchell was re-elected as chair, and, after a healthy discussion, we decided that our goals and priorities would not be much different than in previous years, i.e. to fairly and impartially circulate open calls for nominations to all eligible persons for the vacancies we are called upon to fill, and pass the names of all nominees received on to the appropriate authority for further action when required. The committee only plans to deviate from this procedure if insufficient nominations are received to fill an open position, in which case we will attempt to find nominees by further publicizing the call and/or approaching individuals directly.

Our only item of unfinished business from last year consisted of determining the rules of eligibility for the position of Faculty Elections Officer. We made a recommendation to Senate in our 2014-15 yearend report that this matter be referred to the bylaws committee for clarification. We hope to receive their ruling before the incumbent's current term expires.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andrew Mitchell, Chair
Senate Nominating Committee

Senate Research Committee

Interim Report to Senate – October, 2015

The Senate Research Committee has been active throughout the summer, holding public consultations on the draft Strategic Research Plan. The meetings and consultations have occurred on the following dates:

- June 11; meeting with CRCs and directors of formal research centres at Acadia
- June 25; meeting with IDST coordinators
- June 30; meeting with Faculty of Pure & Applied Science focus group
- August 18; meeting with Faculty of Arts focus group
- August 20; meeting with Faculty of Professional Studies focus group
- September 11; Committee meeting

The Committee is currently conducting the final consultations, with the intent of submitting the draft to Senate for the November 2015 meeting.

Current membership:

David MacKinnon	Chair; Research & Graduate Studies
Zelda Abramson	Sociology
John Colton	Community Development
Danny Silver	Computer Science
Bill Brackney	Theology
Erin Patterson	Library
Brenda Trofanenko	Education (Canada Research Chair)
Anna Redden	Biology (Director, ACER)
Sara Klapstein	Graduate student
Todd Dow	Undergraduate (Honours) Student

Submitted by:

David MacKinnon
Chair

RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD TRANSITION CHAIR REPORT, 2015–2016

Committee membership: Joan Boutilier (Community), Graduate Student Representative (TBA)*, David Duke (Arts), Anita Hudak (Community), David MacKinnon* (RGS), Stephen Maitzen (Chair), Susan Potter (PAS), Anna Robbins (Theology), Conor Vibert (FPS)

* non-voting

Schedule of face-to-face meetings: 3 September, 1 October, 5 November, 3 December, 14 January 2016, 4 February, 3 March, 7 April, 5 May, 2 June, 7 July

Goals and priorities: The timely review of research ethics applications in accordance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement, Second Edition (TCPS2), and the resolution of any other issues that arise with respect to the ethics of human-subjects research at Acadia

Committee Chair for upcoming year: Stephen Maitzen

Submitted by: Stephen Maitzen (Transition Chair)

Timetable, Instruction and Examinations committee

The TIE committee met on September 24, 2015, and elected Rick Mehta as Chair for the 2015 – 2016 academic year. We will meet again during the Fall reading week to discuss a meeting schedule for the semester. This committee will meet face-to-face, and will be working on four issues over the upcoming year (in addition to whatever is requested by Senate).

The first issue is the slot system. There are many problems with the current system, which is making course selection challenging for students; in some cases, students have been forced to take summer courses due to lack of access to required courses during the fall/winter academic terms.

The second issue is the exam timetable. One problem identified was that too many faculty members are putting in requests for accommodations (there were 115 in the winter of 2015), which causes problems with scheduling of final exams. The committee believes it is important that the same rules and principles apply to both faculty members and students (e.g., don't book flights until after the exam timetable has been released).

The third issue was the location of the exams. Many of them are held in the Gymnasium, which is stressful for some students. Other issues that need to be considered with respect to location are class size (large versus small) and the number of sections (a course with a single section versus a course with multiple sections).

Finally, the committee thought it would be important to review Calendar dates and their underlying principles.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick Mehta, Chair, TIE Committee