

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday, 14 April 2008 beginning at 4:06 p.m. with Chair Ian Wilks presiding and 40 present.

1) Approval of Minutes

- a) Meeting of
10 March 2008

It was moved by R. Perrins and seconded by T. Hergett *that the minutes of Monday, 10 March 2008 be approved as distributed.*

A correction was made to Item 2)b) Para 2 to read: "He noted that current enrolment figures, excluding Theology, are: 2,764 full-time undergraduates, 129 part-time undergraduates, 92 full-time graduates, 227 part-time graduates and for Theology are: 9 full-time undergraduates, 13 part-time undergraduates, 46 full-time graduates and 45 part-time graduates.

MOTION AS CORRECTED WAS CARRIED.

2) Announcements and
Communications

- a) From the Chair
-re Regrets

Regrets were received from S. Barkanova, P. Doerr, J. Hansen, C. Hoult, B. Haggerman, A. Irving, J. Kirk, D. MacKinnon, D. Piper, D. Seamone, M. Trask and J. White.

- re Guests in Attendance

The Chair acknowledged new Student Senators T. Hansen, S. Barron and E. Cullen as well as S. Major and C. Place in attendance to speak on items regarding the Learning Commons and A. Dulhanty as an observer.

- re Agenda

I. Wilks noted the following in regards to today's agenda:

3)a) was deferred

4)c) was for information only in regards to 4)b)

Additions include:

Motion under 4)c) for Senate appointee to Learning Commons AA2.0 Committee

5)a) Curriculum Committee proposed changes for Computer Science

5)b) Nomination Committee notice of motion regarding Senate Chair and Deputy Chair positions for 2008-2009

5)c) VP(A) notice of motion regarding establishment of Senate Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee

- re Presidential Search
Committee Forum

The Chair reminded Senators of their opportunity to meet with the Presidential Search Committee members and the Search Consulting Firm tomorrow – April 15th at the KCIC Auditorium beginning 4:15 p.m.

- b) From the Acting President
& Vice-Chancellor and
Vice-President (Academic)

T. Herman announced that the new Provincial Memorandum of Understanding became effective 1 April 2008 until 30 March 2011. This MOU gives an increase to the operating grant of Acadia University of .7% in 2008-2009, 1% in 2009-2010 and .8% in 2010-2011.

He said that Dalhousie University had established a joint Bachelor of Education program with Memorial University, which was a source of concern for those institutions with an established educational program.

T. Herman felt that the series of workshops at the Learning Commons had been productive and well attended. He reminded Senators of the upcoming workshop for Heads and Directors on Article 12 (date and time to be announced).

He said that enrolment continued to be a serious issue and expressed appreciation to all who have contributed to the effort to bring students to this campus. As well, the Senate Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee had been able to offer the top 100 academic applicants to AU at least \$10,000 each. This initiative has stood us in good stead in the severe competition for students.

R. Jotcham said that enrolment figures this date showed 88% of students returning = 1,566 full-time and 96 part-time students, excluding BEd students who would register in June.

3) Business Arising from the
Previous Minutes

- a) Academic Integrity
Committee - Policy on
Conflict of Interest
Revised **(078-69-INT)**

This item was deferred until the May meeting.

- b) By-Laws Committee –
Change of Mandate for the
Scholarships, Prizes &
Awards Committee
(078-70-LAW)

A Senate By-Laws Committee report (**APPENDIX A**) was distributed electronically in which it considered a proposed change to the mandate for the SPAC as received at the March meeting.

(078-68-SPA)

It was moved by A. Mitchell and seconded by R. Perrins: *that the word "bursaries" be added to the line on page 25 of the Senate By-Laws describing the mandate of the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee (Article VII (n), Section ii (a)) and as given in the March 2008 minutes of the Senate. The amended by-law would read:*

ii. The duties of the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee shall be:
(a) 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.

A. Mitchell noted that it was not the intent to disband the current bursaries committee or to interfere in its work.

P. Corkum said that the By-Laws Committee supported this motion. Senate terms of reference require that this body deal with all matters arising from the award of fellowships, scholarships, bursaries, medals, prizes and other awards and this motion would do that.

Two friendly amendments were accepted: VII(n) ii (a) replace “how” with “policy and process” as reflected above and insert the word “bursaries” into paragraphs (c) and (d) of this article.

Discussion was held on the difference between “entrance scholarship” and “entrance scholar bursaries”. The latter is a program through the Student Aid Office and different from that cover by SPAC.

MOTION WAS CARRIED

I. Wilks confirmed that the report on student financial aid, begun by the *ad hoc* Senate Committee to Review Financial Assistance for Students should now be brought forward by SPAC, as this motion would put the report under its mandate.

4) New Business

a) Graduate Studies

Committee – Curriculum
Change for MSc (Applied
Geomatics) **(078-71-GRD)**

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by R. Raeside *that the curriculum changes to the MSc (Applied Geomatics) as attached to today’s agenda be approved.*

R. Raeside spoke to this motion and noted that this program, in partnership with Nova Scotia Community College, had previous approval from the Senate and now required these two new courses to qualify for MSc status.

MOTION WAS CARRIED

b) Acadia Advantage 2.0 – Defining & Establishing Core Values **(078-72-AAP)**

T. Herman spoke to the document. He said it was intended to explore our understanding and definition of Acadia Advantage 2.0. He said a workshop on this subject was held, was well-attended and resulted in this document. He introduced S. Major, Director of the Learning Commons and C. Place, Senior Manager of Learning Technologies, to speak on this document. Discussion was held with the following points made:

- The expression of core values and essential elements in the document came from the workshop.
- As per a request of the Senate *ad hoc* Acadia Advantage Review Committee, the Learning Commons Steering Committee was created to review the AA program on a regular basis and keep those interested, informed of progress.

- As this document came out of a group which had the Senate AA Review Committee as its core, it was now brought to the Senate for approval
- Inclusion of “flexibility” in the essential elements section was appreciated as this point of much concern to Senators.

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by L. Lusby *that Senate approve this document as attached to today's agenda.*

It was clarified that this motion does not include the creation of the proposed Steering Committee.

A friendly amendment was made to second bullet under “essential elements” to read “to meet the **academic and social** needs of...”

The term "personalized technology" in this document was discussed. It was clarified that the intent of this was to find a balance between students' preferences and faculty environment. However, it should not go so far as to compromise learning.

In reponse to a request for clarification, the chair said that this document formalizes Senate's right to have input into changes in information technology infrastructure at AU when such changes materially affect the delivery of curriculum. The language of this document is general, and would need to be applied on a case-by-case basis.

MOTION AS AMENDED WAS CARRIED

- c) Learning Commons
Acadia Advantage 2.0
Committee with a Senate
Representative
(078-77-AAP)

It was agreed to deal with this item as an addition to the agenda.

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by S. Lochhead *that Senate approve the Learning Commons AA2.0 Committee as outlined in a handout at this meeting (APPENDIX B). This motion would provide communication between this committee and the Senate and would report to but not be a committee of the Senate.*

T. Herman confirmed that the faculty representatives would be elected through each faculty election officer for a term of three years.

As requested by A. Fougere, it was agreed to add a graduate student representative to this committee. This position and the undergraduate student position would be for a term of one year.

The motion was amended to designate the Senior Manager, Learning Technologies (currently C. Place) as the chair of this committee..

T. Herman felt that by stating “this committee would report to Senate” it meant that Senate may request a report at any time, and that the

committee can request to report to Senate at any time.

MOTION AS AMENDED WAS APPROVED.

d) Learning Commons
Steering Committee –
Composition to Include
Senate Representatives
(078-74-LER)

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by S. Lochhead *that the Senate appoint five Senators (one from each of the faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, Pure & Applied Science, Theology and the Community) to serve on the Learning Commons Steering Committee for a term of three years.*

S. Symons noted that Agenda Item 4)c) - the Learning Commons Mission Statement was included for information only on this matter.

T. Herman spoke to this motion and said that without the Senate-appointed members the representation on this committee would not be sufficiently broad.

As per By-Laws Article VI) 2) these initial appointments would be made on a staggered basis.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

e) Internet Service During
Classroom Instruction
(078-76-APR)

As distributed with the agenda, it was moved by K. Whetter and seconded by B. Moody *that Computing Services install the necessary technology in classrooms to enable teaching staff to block or shut down internet and server access in classrooms. This should be done as quickly as possible.*

K. Whetter spoke to this motion on behalf of others in his faculty and said that technology services may know of other possible solutions suitable to achieve this end. He felt that to have students on computers during instruction is a distraction and interferes with classroom pedagogy. Taking classroom notes is understandable, but access to the internet is not. With wireless access it is impossible to police.

Discussion followed with the following points made:

- Student representatives felt the student body should be consulted on this issue
- It seems wrong to give a tool (computer) and then say don't use it.
- Discussion with students in individual classes regarding this problem might be helpful.
- More information regarding how this might be done is needed to make an informed decision.
- Such intervention at other institutions has been controversial and we must be prepared for the same.
- We need clarification on how this would affect online examinations and how this problem is handled by exam proctors.
- We need to know if this is technically possible before any consultations with those affected.

- This issue should be referred to the newly formed AA2.0 Committee.
- The Learning Commons would be the place to organize a debate on this issue and find solutions

It was moved by G. Ness and seconded by E. Cullen *that this motion be tabled pending more information.*

The Chair will contact Paul Steele of the Computing Centre regarding technical possibilities with this issue and report at the May meeting.

MOTION TO TABLE WAS CARRIED.

f) Academic Program Review
Committee – External
Program Review of
Department of History &
Classics and Response
(078-76-APR)

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by A. Fougere *that the recommendations and departmental responses of Section F of the Academic Program Review of the Department of History & Classics as attached to today's agenda be approved.*

B. Moody noted an amendment to the APRC Report on this Review as distributed as page 1 of the attachment. Paragraph two, line five should read “Acting Head”. He continued that all recommendations of this review were received favourably.

T. Herman noted that the review committee was pleased with the cooperation of this department and a follow up protocol for the recommendations would be put in place as well as, where possible, resources made available to support changes.

Much discussion was held on whether Senate should be “accepting” or “approving” this report. I. Wilks said that where there is a power, there is accountability in that upon which the power is exercised. If there was concern in the future about the direction of this department in terms of some of these provisions, that concern could be raised on the floor of the Senate and a discussion held. The argument could be that the unit is not taking the direction as laid down in the recommendations of this report. What Senate would choose to require as a result of that discussion and that concern would depend upon the context and the wisdom of Senate at that time. There can be no question that when Senate exercises a power of approval there is a corresponding accountability on the part of that over which the power is exercised.

Other comments were made:

- Some departments with similar needs may not benefit or have the same authority to turn to.
- Some recommendations of this report which are issues of precedence would benefit all faculty, if accepted, not just the department being reviewed – i.e. replacing retirees with tenured positions.
- Some Senators wondered how the Senate could approve recommendations and responses if there was a conflict or difference of

opinion within this section.

- These reports carry powerful and important messages about curriculum change and renewal, but they may also make budget demands on the University which lie outside Senate's domain.
- Senate power understood but it creates inequities.
- The Senate APRC brings forward a summary for each program review and perhaps Senate should be approving this summary, where there is no chance of conflicting views.

I. Wilks said that program review recommendations would have to be styled in such a way as to be appropriate for approval. If there is a problem with some of the recommendations, the committee should change them so that Senate can still approve them; the committee should deal with such problems by changing the recommendations, not the motion to approve them. He argued that if Senate does not lay claim to the power of final approval over program review documents then that power will not disappear -- it will simply migrate to another part of the university, probably the administration. He welcomed revisiting any past program review report which may have been "received" rather than "approved", if any Senator wished to bring such a report back to the Senate

T. Herman said he was sensitive to the concerns about the equal treatment of academic units in the review process, but with the amount of work involved in one of these reviews it is impossible to cover more than a small number of units in a given academic year. An attempt has been made to accelerate the review process. This situation is still preferable to having no review and no accountability whatsoever. One must rely on the sincerity of one's colleagues to ensure that resources will be equitably distributed and recommendations will be acted upon. The review process cannot be abandoned.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

5) Other Business
a) Curriculum Change for
Computer Science
(078-78-CRE)

It was agreed to waive full notice of motion time period for curriculum changes for this item.

It was moved by D. Silver and seconded by R. Raeside *that Senate approve the curriculum change proposal for Computer Science as distributed electronically as addition to today's agenda*
(APPENDIX C).

D. Silver spoke to this motion and said this would enable Computer Science students to double major.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

b) Nominating Committee –
Nominations for Senate
Vacancies 2008-2009

(078-79-NOM)

P. Corkum of the Senate Nominating Committee gave notice of motion as per the committee report distributed (**APPENDIX D**):

- a) Chair of Senate (1 year term 2008-2009): Ian Wilks
- b) Deputy Chair of Senate (1 year term 2008-2009): Paul Hobson

She noted that a vacant Senator position occurs on the Senate Library Committee and requested any interested please come forward. As well, five Senators are needed for the newly formed positions on the Learning Commons Steering Committee.

- c) Vice-President (Academic)
-Tenure-Track Teaching
Complement Allocation
Committee (**078-80-TCA**)

T. Herman gave notice of motion to strike a standing committee of Senate called the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee as outlined in a handout at this meeting (**APPENDIX E**).

- 6) Adjournment

R. Perrins moved this meeting be adjourned. It was 6:17 p.m.

D. Murphy, Recording Secretary

By-laws Committee
April 14, 2008

Amendment to Scholarship, Prizes and Awards Committee

As instructed by Senate at the 10 March, 2008 Senate meeting, the By-laws Committee has considered the motion in respect to an addition to the mandate for the Scholarships, Prizes & Awards Committee.

Motion for consideration (078-70-LAW)

The motion for consideration is as follows:

That the word “bursaries” be added to the line on page 25 of the Senate By-laws describing the mandate of the Scholarship, Prizes and Awards Committee. (Article VIII (n) ii a.)

The amended by-law would state

VIII. (n) (ii) The duties of the Scholarship, Prizes and Awards Committee shall be:

- a. To decide how winners of scholarship, prizes, **bursaries** and awards are to be selected and to gather all information it considers necessary for the selection.

Friendly Amendment

Under Section I. (g) of The Terms of Reference of the Senate By-laws Senate has the power: *to deal with all matters arising in the connection with the award of fellowships, scholarships, **bursaries**, medals, prizes and other awards.*

The committee agrees that the Scholarship, Prizes and Awards Committee is the appropriate committee to oversee this responsibility. The By-laws Committee suggests however that the motion:

- Insert the words “the policy and process on ” prior to the word “how” in paragraph a., and
- also insert the word “bursaries” into paragraphs c and d.

If approved this would result in the following amended mandate for the Scholarship, Prizes and Awards Committee

VIII. (n) (ii) The duties of the Scholarship, Prizes and Awards Committee shall be:

- a. To decide **the policy and process on** how winners of scholarship, prizes, **bursaries** and awards are to be selected and to gather all information it considers necessary for the selection.
- b. To select the winners of all undergraduate scholarships, prizes and awards;
- c. Periodically to investigate the scholarships, prizes, **bursaries** and awards program and to recommend improvements (increased funds, new scholarships, more prizes, etc.) to those involved in the program;
- d. To promote interest in the scholarships and **bursaries** programs by posters, letters, and other means;

- e. To consider such other matters as the Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

Commentary

In October 2006 the Senate ad hoc Committee to Review Financial Assistance for Students was established. The Committee finished its report but is now inactive with the loss of its Chair and other committee members.

The Coordinator of Scholarships, Awards, and Financial Assistance (SPAC) is a member of the Scholarship, Prizes and Awards Committee (SPAC) and is a member of the ad hoc Committee. In the event bursaries do come under the umbrella of SPAC, it is recommended that the report be brought to SPAC by the Coordinator of Scholarships, Awards, and Financial Assistance and that SPAC then present the report to Senate.

Respectfully submitted:

Patricia Corkum, Chair
Svetlana Barkanova
William Brakney
Barry Moody

AA2.0 Committee

Acadia Advantage, and now Acadia Advantage 2.0, is fundamentally an academic initiative and its evolution should be driven by faculty and the academic sector.

To this end the Learning Commons, in support of teaching and learning at Acadia, is establishing an AA2.0 Committee that will meet regularly to ensure two things happen:

1. Appropriate and ongoing documentation and review of Acadia Advantage, and;
2. Clear communication to the university community and beyond regarding the work of the committee.

This work will help to provide direction to the academic sector with regards to educational technology and also inform future university marketing and communication strategies.

The committee will be made up of the following:

- Senior Manager, Learning Technologies (Chair)
- Director, Learning Commons
- **A representative of Senate**
- A representative from the Faculty of Arts
- A representative from the Faculty of Professional Studies
- A representative from the Faculty of Science
- A representative from the Faculty of Theology
- Director of Open Acadia
- University Librarian
- Executive Director, Technology Services
- Executive Director, Communications & Marketing
- Graduate Student Representative
- Undergraduate Student Representative

The Learning Commons requests Senate participation in the group through a Senate appointee to the committee.

Acadia University Senate Curriculum Committee 2007-2008
Form 5: New program proposal

Please provide the secretary of the Curriculum Committee with 10 copies of this submission, photocopied double-sided.

Department/School: Jodrey School of Computer Science

Date: March 7, 2008

Presented to Faculty Council? Presented to FPAS Curriculum Committee on March 11 2008.

(Append **one** copy of the Faculty Minutes dealing with this course)

1. Briefly (one paragraph) outline the nature of the new program.
Bachelor of Science with Computer Science as the second major.
2. Briefly state the reason(s) for requesting this new program. Please be specific.
To meet student demand.
3. Will this new program alter, in any substantive way, the way any other programs are currently delivered?
No
4. Has the proposed program been discussed with students?
No
5. If so, do students approve of it?
Not applicable.
If you checked No to questions 4-5 above, please explain your answer(s).
The proposed program does not affect our computer science students and we therefore did not discuss it with them.
6. Indicate the exact program description you would like to appear in the next University Calendar.
Bachelor of Science with Computer Science as the second major (36h)
Comp 1113, 1123, 2103, 2113, 2203, 2213, 12h Comp electives at the 2000+ level (except Comp 2903, 2913) of which at least 6h must be at the 3000+ level. (30h)
Math 1413, 2433. (6h)
7. Will this program result in the addition of any new courses?
No
8. Will this program result in the deletion of any existing courses?
No
9. Will this program result in substantive modifications to any existing courses?
No
10. Other relevant information.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Nominations
April 15, 2008

The Committee places in nomination the following names for the positions listed:

- a) Chair of Senate (1 year term 2008-2009): Ian Wilks
- b) Deputy Chair of Senate (1 year term 2008-2009): Paul Hobson

Respectfully submitted:

Patricia Corkum (Chair)
William Brackney
Paul Callaghan
Anne Quéma
Doug Symons
Holger Teismann
Anthony Thomson
Tom Herman (Acting President)