



A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday, 10 December 2007 beginning at 4:08 p.m. with Chair, Ian Wilks presiding and 41 present.

1) Approval of Minutes

- a) Meeting of  
9 October 2007

It was moved by R. Perrins and seconded by C. Hoult *that the minutes of Tuesday, 9 October 2007 be approved as distributed.*

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

- b) Meeting of  
7 November 2007

It was moved by R. Perrins and seconded by C. Hoult *that the minutes of Wednesday, 7 November 2007 be approved as distributed.*

The following amendment was made:

p. 5, 3)d) fourth line should read "three exams in a row".

MOTION AS AMENDED WAS CARRIED.

2) Announcements and  
Communications

- a) From the Chair  
-re Regrets

Regrets were received from W. Brackney, T. Hergett, A. Irving, D. Julien, G. Ness, D. Piper, R. Raeside, D. Symons, and M. Trask.

- re Visitors in Attendance

The Chair acknowledged the following guests to this meeting: P. Arnold and G. Poulter of the Senate Faculty Development Committee, P. D'Entremont of the Senate Scholarships, Prizes, & Awards Committee, and A. Dulhanty as an observer.

- re Senate Membership

I. Wilks noted the following changes in Senate membership because of six-month sabbatical leaves beginning in January: J. Eustace will be replaced by L. Whaley and S. Markham-Starr will be replaced by A. Warner. R. Wilson announced that Harry Gardner will begin as Dean of Theology on January 1<sup>st</sup>.

- re Agenda

Addition to the agenda was three notices of motion from the Senate By-Laws Committee.

- b) From the President &  
Vice-Chancellor

G. Dinter-Gottlieb expressed gratitude for all who have worked diligently to make this semester and exam period as smooth as possible for students. She commented on the MacLean's survey which calculated graduation from first year through six or seven years and it showed AU rate of graduation was low - 64%. She felt that as hard as everyone is working at recruiting students, it is just as important to work on issues

of retention and success for students. It is not just a student life issue, it needs to be a strategic initiative with the faculty and the staff at AU. We have a Retention Committee and she encouraged faculty to be involved in retention efforts as they are developed. The student affairs sector is also developing a strategy for retention. The reasons students leave AU are many and cut across both academic and non-academic issues. However, only the faculty can address the academic issues and it is hoped that through the Learning Commons, we can get a series of academic based initiatives that would improve retention. A look at issues of retention of our students and an attempt to put a value on returning students as well as getting a deeper understanding of why students leave AU was her goal. She hoped that there would be interest and support at Senate on this issue. She felt that if AU is selective in terms of accepting students, it should be expected that it would result in a higher retention and graduation rate.

T. Herman also spoke to this idea and felt that this issue cut across all sectors of the campus. In order to address it, opportunities to discuss would be held in the near future.

c) From the Vice-President  
(Academic)

T. Herman also thanked Senators, Faculty, and Staff for their great efforts to minimize the stress on students this past month. He requested that the SPAC consider eliminating the use of this term's grades in calculation of in-course scholarships at the end of the year. Also he asked that this committee lift the 30-hour minimum course requirement of some awards, for this term.

He reported that a search committee for the Associated Vice-President Research & Graduate Studies position had been formed and would meet early in the new year.

d) From the Registrar

R. Jotcham reported that the enabling motion was used in two cases for the Fall Convocation. One as a result of the late arrival of a grade and the second as a result of a student neglecting to apply to graduate.

3) Business Arising from the  
Minutes

a) Admissions & Academic  
Standing committee (Policy)  
Memoranda-of-  
Understanding between  
ACU and the APCCC  
(078-17-AAS)

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by J. White *that the Memoranda-of-Understanding between the Atlantic Canadian Universities and the Atlantic Provinces Community Colleges Consortium for the encouragement of transfer agreements be approved by the Senate.*

R. Jotcham noted that this agreement is a fairly general MOU and AU is still in a position to determine specifics for course transfer.

It was felt that more information was needed to enable Senators to vote on this motion. T. Herman suggested this would be distributed with the

January agenda.

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by J. Eustace *that this motion be tabled until the next meeting of the Senate.*

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

- 4) New Business
  - b) 2006-2007 Annual Reports from Senate Committees **(067-71-REP)**
    - i) Scholarship, Prizes, & Awards **(067-71-REP)**

It was moved by C. Hoult and seconded by J. Eustace *that the Scholarship, Prizes, & Awards Committee annual report for 2006-2007, as attached to today's agenda, be received.*

P. D'Entremont spoke to this motion as attached to today's agenda. She noted that 387 offers for entrance scholarships were made with 53% acceptance.

In reply to a question from the floor, P. D'Entremont noted that Achievement Awards were not set by this committee and the timing of such was frustrating and challenging to the SPAC as well as departments.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

- b) Timetable, Instruction Hours, & Examination Committee - 2008-2009 University Timetable **(078-28-TIE)**

It was moved by C. Hoult and seconded by S. Koul *that Senate approve the timetable for the 2008 - 2009 academic year as attached to today's agenda.*

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

- c) Faculty of Theology - Curriculum Changes **(078-29-TIE)**

It was moved by R. Wilson and seconded by B. Hagerman *that the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Theology as attached to today's agenda, be approved.*

R. Wilson spoke to this motion and noted that it was an effort to clarify some theology curriculum issues.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

- d) Faculty Development Committee - Endowed Chairs **(078-30-THE)**

It was moved by R. Perrins and seconded by D. Seamone *that Senate approve the Senate Faculty Development Committee report on endowed chairs at Acadia University, as attached to today's agenda.*

G. Poulter, of this committee, spoke to this motion and noted an amendment in the form of a spelling error - it should read "principal" throughout this report.

She noted that this report is a result of a request to the Faculty Development Committee, in April. Details of this request were laid out at the April 2007 meeting of the Senate. She regretted that committee members were not able to find details of the original intent of many of these Chairs and thus not able to make an informed report on each individual Chair. The most recent of the seventeen Chairs was formed in the 80's. All that was available was a list of Chairs at AU and the amount of the principal for each. In reply to a question from the floor, G. Poulter said it could not be established that the unused funds are going back to the individual Chair funds.

A lengthy discussion followed with the following points brought forth:

- ▶ Once established, the committee felt that chair details should be circulated to Department Heads for information.
- ▶ G. Dinter-Gottlieb noted that no Chair monies have been dispersed or paid out in fifteen years.
- ▶ No decision made on unknown monies - further thought on this issue needed.
- ▶ Elaborate research plan should not be necessary for such small amounts of money.
- ▶ No limit on awards received - this to be determined by the department involved.
- ▶ Assumed that these chairs criteria based on research.
- ▶ Although original monies to Chairs formed 150 years is small compared to today's standards, some way should be found to acknowledge the contribution made to Acadia University and keep alive the memory of the donor.
- ▶ Foulis Chair (Engineering) exempt as the criteria is well laid out and available.
- ▶ It was felt more investigation for original information was needed and this should be in the University Archives, the Board of Governor's records (as custodian of these positions), as well as in the individual departments concerned. Original intent should be known.
- ▶ It was believed that the early Chairs were set up as teaching rather than research Chairs.
- ▶ Monies from this source into a public lecture series fund was discussed; however, there could be legal implications regarding redirecting these funds.
- ▶ It was suggested that the University's Manager of Public Accounting would have records of each of these funds and should be contacted. This Manager may be able to help with background information of original terms of reference for these Chairs and should be contacted.

It was moved by S. Markham-Starr and seconded by L. Lusby *that the last line of item 2)iii) of this report be amended to read "Successful applicants must show evidence of excellence in teaching and research."*

G. Dinter-Gottlieb reminded the meeting that Senate was asked to draw up criteria according to the known procedure for each Chair, not to

disperse funds. Any original restrictions must be honoured and in order to have any integrity as an institution, which receives donations, we must ensure that when possible, they are dispersed according to the letter of the law, in terms of the donor agreement. Any changes to be made must be done so through the BOG Investment Committee.

Discussion continued:

- ▶ If given a choice, departments should decide if a chair is to be awarded on teaching or research.
- ▶ Discussion is not possible without more information of original mandate, intent, and procedure.
- ▶ The BOG Investment Committee is responsible for these funds and should be consulted.
- ▶ It was obvious that extensive historical research is needed to find this information and it was felt unfair to ask the Faculty Development Committee to do this. In future, such research might be done by an *ad hoc* committee of interested Senators.
- ▶ Sherri Longley is a researcher and may be the person to approach for such historical research.
- ▶ The feeling was that the Chair of Senate should proceed with a request to the BOG Investment Committee for this information as it is their custodial duty to oversee these funds.

It was moved by A. Quéma and seconded by P. Hobson *that this motion be tabled.*

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

I. Wilks confirmed that he would write to the Board of Governor's Secretary requesting information on each of the seventeen Chairs of Acadia University. In this communication he would ask that if the procedure was unknown, what is the procedure to define such terms. Also, what is the current handling of the interest for each of these funds. He agreed that the Senate does not want to accept the legal responsibility of this task.

He clarified that there was no requirement for the Faculty Development Committee to proceed further at this time.

e) Vice-President (Academic)  
Annual Report  
(078-31-VPA)

T. Herman spoke to the Annual Vice-President (Academic) Report that was distributed to each Senator on a CD with today's agenda. This is the first report from the VP(A) Office since 2002-2003. He said this report was to celebrate all that faculty does at Acadia University and is a compilation of information received from the Deans' Offices.

5) Other Business  
a) By-Laws Committee -  
Notice of Motion re  
Renaming the Senate  
Academic Discipline  
Appeals Committee

**(078-31-LAW)**

Further to a handout from the Senate By-Laws Committee (**APPENDIX A**), P. Corkum gave the following notice of motion: *that the Academic Discipline Appeals Committee not be renamed to accommodate Academic appeals of a non-disciplinary nature such as appeals for Special Examinations.*

b) By-Laws Committee -  
Notice of Motion re  
Special Examinations  
**(078-32-LAW)**

Further to a handout from the Senate By-Laws Committee (**APPENDIX A**), P. Corkum gave the following notice of motion: *that the regulations for special examinations as approved at the September, 2007 Senate meeting be revised to the following:*

Special Examinations

A student, who, because of unavoidable circumstances, was detained or rendered unfit to write a required examination, may **request** a Special Examination.

1. Special Examinations for medical reasons

a. A student who wishes to have such a **request** considered must within 48 hours after the end of the examination, report, or have a representative report, to the Registrar (in writing if possible) the intention to **request** a special examination and within one week after the end of the examination submit to the Registrar a written request for a Special Examination. This request must be accompanied by an explanation of the circumstances that made it impossible for the student to write the regular examination and a medical doctor's report.

2. Special Examinations for non-medical reasons

a. A student who wishes to have such a **request** considered must within 48 hours after the end of the examination, report, or have a representative report, to the Registrar (in writing if possible) the intention to **request** a Special Examination and within one week after the end of the examination submit to the Registrar a written request for a special examination. This request must be accompanied by an explanation of the circumstances that made it impossible for the student to write the regular examination and any supporting documentation.

b. After reviewing the written request and accompanying documentation, the Registrar will consult with the course instructor as to the legitimacy of the **request**.

c. Should the Registrar and the course instructor agree that the student be allowed to write the final examination, the procedures outlined in point 3 of this section shall be followed.

d. Should the Registrar and the course instructor agree that the student not be allowed to write the final examination, the Registrar shall communicate that decision to the student in writing, apprising the student of the right to appeal the joint decision.

e. A student who wishes to appeal the joint decision of the registrar and the course instructor must do so in writing to the **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)** through the VPA within seven days of receiving the decision.

f. Should the Registrar and the course instructor disagree, the matter shall be referred to the **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)**.

g. Where the student is appealing the joint decision of the Registrar and the course instructor, the **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)** shall convene within a **reasonable length of time** of the VPA's receipt of the written appeal, **based upon the circumstances**.

h. Where the Registrar and the course instructor disagree, the **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)** shall convene within a **reasonable length of time** of the meeting between the Registrar and the course instructor, **based upon the circumstances**.

i. The **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)** shall meet individually with the Registrar, the student, and the course instructor before rendering its decision in camera.

j. The decision shall be made by simple majority and it shall be binding.

k. The decision shall be communicated in writing to the Registrar, student, and course instructor.

l. Should the committee decide to allow the Special Examination, the procedures outlined in point 3 of this section shall be followed.

3. The responsibility for setting and conducting special examinations will lie with schools and departments. Special examinations should be completed as soon as possible and normally (i.e. wherever possible) by the end of the January immediately following for December exemptions and by the end of the May immediately following for April exemptions.

## **PART B**

The current wording of the mandate for the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS) reads- *to hear appeals against academic regulations or the interpretation of such regulations that have not been resolved at the Departmental, School, or Faculty level or through the Registrar's Office.*

- c) By-Laws Committee -  
Notice of Motion re  
Revision of Mandate for  
the Admissions &  
Academic Standing  
Committee (Appeals)  
**(078-33-LAW)**

Further to a handout from the Senate By-Laws Committee (**APPENDIX A**), P. Corkum gave the following notice of motion: *that the wording of the mandate for the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (Appeals) be changed to read - to hear appeals **in respect to or arising from** academic regulations or the interpretation of such regulations that have not been resolved at the Departmental, School, or Faculty level or through the Registrar's Office.*

- d) Vice-President (Academic)  
- Notice of Motion re  
Appointment of Chair of  
Research Ethics Board  
**(078-34-REB)**

Further to a handout from the Vice-President (Academic) (**APPENDIX B**), T. Herman gave the following notice of motion: *that Senate approve the re-appointment of Dr. Stephen Maitzen to the Research Ethics Board in the capacity as Chair for the period July 1, 2008 - June 30, 2011.*

- 6) Adjournment

R. Perrins moved this meeting be adjourned. It was 5:35 p.m.

By-laws Committee  
December 10, 2007  
3 Motions to Senate

**PART A**

As instructed by Senators at the September, 2007 Senate meeting, the By-laws Committee has considered certain motions passed at that meeting.

**1) Renaming the Senate Academic Discipline Appeals Committee (078-07-ADA)**

The motion presented and passed follows:

*Whereas the Academic Discipline Appeals Committee seems the most appropriate body to hear Academic appeals of a non-disciplinary nature such as appeals for Special Examinations, Senate moves that the committee be renamed the Academic Appeals Committee.*

The Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS) already exists to handle Academic appeals of a non-disciplinary nature such as appeals for Special Examinations. Its mandate is *“to hear appeals against academic regulations or the interpretation of such regulations that have not been resolved at the Departmental, School, or Faculty level or through the Registrar’s Office”*.

**MOTION 1:**

**That the Academic Discipline Appeals Committee not be renamed to accommodate Academic appeals of a non-disciplinary nature such as appeals for Special Examinations.**

**2) Special Examinations (078-08-TIE)**

The By-laws Committee believes that the approved regulations per the Senate September 2007 meeting for Special Examinations should be revised for the following:

- to change the word appeal to ***request*** wherever appeal appears prior to part 2. d. of the regulation.
- to change the reference from Academic Appeals Committee to ***Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)***.
- to change in parts 1g. and 1h. of the regulation the amount of time in which the Committee convenes on an appeal from 7 days to ***a reasonable length of time based upon the circumstances.***



## MOTION 2

**That the regulations for special examinations as approved at the September, 2007 Senate meeting be revised to the following:**

### Special Examinations

A student, who, because of unavoidable circumstances, was detained or rendered unfit to write a required examination, may **request** a Special Examination.

#### 1. Special Examinations for medical reasons

a. A student who wishes to have such a **request** considered must within 48 hours after the end of the examination, report, or have a representative report, to the Registrar (in writing if possible) the intention to **request** a special examination and within one week after the end of the examination submit to the Registrar a written request for a Special Examination. This request must be accompanied by an explanation of the circumstances that made it impossible for the student to write the regular examination and a medical doctor's report.

#### 2. Special Examinations for non-medical reasons

a. A student who wishes to have such a **request** considered must within 48 hours after the end of the examination, report, or have a representative report, to the Registrar (in writing if possible) the intention to **request** a Special Examination and within one week after the end of the examination submit to the Registrar a written request for a special examination. This request must be accompanied by an explanation of the circumstances that made it impossible for the student to write the regular examination and any supporting documentation.

b. After reviewing the written request and accompanying documentation, the Registrar will consult with the course instructor as to the legitimacy of the **request**.

c. Should the Registrar and the course instructor agree that the student be allowed to write the final examination, the procedures outlined in point 3 of this section shall be followed.

d. Should the Registrar and the course instructor agree that the student not be allowed to write the final examination, the Registrar shall communicate that decision to the student in writing, apprising the student of the right to appeal the joint decision.

e. A student who wishes to appeal the joint decision of the registrar and the course instructor must do so in writing to the **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)** through the VPA within seven days of receiving the decision.

f. Should the Registrar and the course instructor disagree, the matter shall be referred to the **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)**.

g. Where the student is appealing the joint decision of the Registrar and the course instructor, the **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)** shall convene within a **reasonable length of time** of the VPA's receipt of the written appeal, **based upon the circumstances**.

h. Where the Registrar and the course instructor disagree, the **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)** shall convene within a **reasonable length of time** of the meeting between the Registrar and the course instructor, **based upon the circumstances**.

i. The **Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS)** shall meet individually with the Registrar, the student, and the course instructor before rendering its decision in camera.

j. The decision shall be made by simple majority and it shall be binding.

k. The decision shall be communicated in writing to the Registrar, student, and course instructor.

l. Should the committee decide to allow the Special Examination, the procedures outlined in point 3 of this section shall be followed.

3. The responsibility for setting and conducting special examinations will lie with schools and departments. Special examinations should be completed as soon as possible and normally (i.e. wherever possible) by the end of the January immediately following for December exemptions and by the end of the May immediately following for April exemptions.

**PART B**

The current wording of the mandate for the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS) reads- *to hear appeals against academic regulations or the interpretation of such regulations that have not been resolved at the Departmental, School, or Faculty level or through the Registrar's Office.*

**MOTION 3**

That the wording of the mandate for the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (APPEALS) be changed to read- *to hear appeals **in respect to or arising from** academic regulations or the interpretation of such regulations that have not been resolved at the Departmental, School, or Faculty level or through the Registrar's Office.*

Respectfully submitted:

Patricia Corkum, Chair  
William Brackney  
Barry Moody  
Svetlana Barkanova

**MOTION:**

That Senate approve the re-appointment of Dr. Stephen Maitzen to the Research Ethics Board in the capacity as Chair for the period July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2011.

Note: The Research Ethics Board has given their unanimous support of Dr. Maitzen's leadership for another term.