



A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University was held on Monday, 8 December 2008 beginning at 4:10pm with Chair Ian Wilks presiding. 30 members and 7 guests were present.

1) Minutes of the Meeting of
10 November 2008

It was moved by B Verstraete and seconded by T. Hansen that the minutes of 10 November 2008 be approved as circulated.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2) Announcements and
Communications

a) From the Chair

-re Regrets

Regrets were received from W. Brackney, P. Corkum, H. Gardener, A. Irving, D. Julien, M. Keaveny, J. Kirk, R. Lehr, L. Lusby, M. Trask and A. Vibert.

-re Guests

The Chair welcomed guests S. Major, V. Provencal, R. Pitter, J. Saklofske, E. Callaghan, J. Holt, S. Mockford present at the meeting in support of item 3. A) on the agenda – the First Year Alternative Project.

-re Agenda

The Chair advised that items 4) c) and d) from today's agenda have been deferred while item 4) e) has been withdrawn. A new item, a report from the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee has been added as item 3) b).

c) From the President (Acting)
& Vice-President
(Academic)

-re Search for Dean of Pure
and Applied Science

The advertisement for the position will be out in a few days. Closing for the search which is both internal and external will be February 16.

-re Recruitment

T Herman has recently returned from recruiting trips to Quebec, Ontario and the Boston area. He visited schools that had been indentified as having a mission and mandate similar to our own. This is a strategic approach that he favours. He was encouraged by the number and quality of students who were interested in Acadia. We have a good profile in Quebec and Ontario and are well positioned to build our profile in New England. Acadia is an attractive option based on the financial outlook in the US and the lower Canadian dollar. We are able to offer a private college experience for the cost of a local public institution. The First Year Alternative Project was very well received by potential applicants when it was presented as an option that Acadia was considering. Acadia has purchased a new module of the ezRecruit software that connects us with all high school guidance counselors in Canada and the US in a more efficient and streamlined way.

There has been a significant increase in ezRecruit traffic in recent weeks. As well, the recruiting staff visited school fairs in Canada, the US and the Caribbean. He thanked faculty for their involvement in events, videos and recruitment committees. He noted that the video clips on Acadia TV have been visited over 1600 times in the last week.

An Alumni program has been launched that encourages children and grandchildren of alumni to come to Acadia through a \$500 tuition award.

All of these initiatives are generating excitement on the recruiting front.

M Snyder described a problem with ezRecruit that several potential students experienced. T. Herman will check into this.

3) Business Arising from the Minutes

a) Curriculum Committee – First-Year Alternative

Project (089-20-CRE) (Cont'd)

Further to the agenda of 10 Nov 08, it was moved by A. Quéma, seconded by P. Rigg *that the Senate Curriculum Committee hereby moves that the proposal for the six courses of Acadia's First Year Alternative project and the Calendar description of this project be adopted.*

A. Quéma explained that there had been several rounds of consultation with the First Year Alternative Committee regarding their submission to the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee is satisfied with the proposal in its current state and encourages senators to discuss the proposal.

S. Major spoke to the motion. She stated that the committee had met with all three faculties to discuss the proposal. The proposal is for innovative courses for 50 students offered as 3 courses each semester. Each course will be presented in a 4 week time frame. The courses are team taught and trans-disciplinary in nature.

V. Provencal invited questions if any still remained after the project had been so extensively discussed within faculties.

M. Snyder asked if students apply to Acadia first, prior to knowing if they will be accepted into the project. She wanted to know what would be done if too many students wanted to be part of the alternative. S Major confirmed that students were admitted to Acadia before being admitted to the First Year Alternative and that the committee would keep a close watch on applications to be sure that once spaces were filled students who could not participate would be let down 'softly'.

V. Provencal stated that the Alternative was designed to feed back into the more traditional first year at Acadia with minimum disruption to the student.

G. Whitehall asked whether there should be a rider on the motion that the project would move forward contingent to faculty being available while not reducing or taking away from existing funding for current programs.

The Chair asked for clarification regarding whether or not there was an additional cost associated with the initiative.

S. Major confirmed that there was a cost. There would be 6 per course replacements required to replace the faculty who would be teaching the courses.

V. Provencal stated that since this initiative involves recruiting students the initiative would more than pay for itself if these students who come because of the Alternative stay to complete their degrees. The estimate is that 50 students represent more than 1 million dollars revenue during the length of their program. The Alternative is looking for new students to Acadia. If there are

not at least 20 students involved in the project, it would not go ahead.

Chair asked if this should be incorporated into the motion.

V. Provencal commented that it would be possible to say that money would not be taken from current programs. It is more difficult to require that new funding be found unless recruiting additional students is viewed as additional funding. The need to secure additional funding other than tuition revenue would make this proposal unsupportable.

The Chair asked if language such as that related to the nursing program that was approved at the last meeting might be applicable here:

With a clear understanding that:

- 1) Additional faculty required to implement this program would be in addition to the 182 minimum number of tenure-track faculty stipulated in the 12th Collective Agreement; and
- 2) That any additional fiscal resources required to launch and sustain this program be new resources and not be taken from any existing program.”

S. Major indicated that this Alternative is not proposing any full time positions. If there is a need to wait for a donor for funding it would not be possible to move forward for next September.

A. Quéma stated that the problem is complex. This is a project not a program and students involved in it will still be declaring a major when they enter Acadia so the division of the revenue that they represent will need to be distributed between their department and the project. How will this be done?

T. Herman stated that it was not as simple as giving revenue to the departments whose majors take the courses. New money will be brought in by the students' tuition but their ultimate program at Acadia will be unknown at the time of their arrival. There needs to be flexibility to allocate resources where they are needed to sustain the students. Overly onerous restrictions on the money coming in from the project should not be put in place. There should be enough flexibility to attach the money to programs that need it due to increased subscription. Funding should be sought for new programs; it need not be restricted to tuition. External funding may be needed for the first year. The flexibility to seek that funding is needed. It is important that this flexibility is not constrained by the motion.

P. Williams stated that this project is different from the nursing program. The nursing program is not an experiment while the first year project is. It will be important to assess the success or failure of this project next year at about this time or later to determine the impact on students and recruitment. He stated that the \$60,000 to \$70,000 in this project for per course replacements is a small investment for an interesting experiment. Senate should thoroughly review the program after one cycle. The review should include the academic component, student success, and recruitment.

The Chair pointed out that the suggestion of using the wording from the nursing program motion was only a possible option. There was as yet no amendment for consideration related to the current motion.

G. Whitehall requested clarity on the financial matters. He was under the impression that money for recruiting was already available and that the 50 students mentioned would not be from the students already recruited but would be an additional 50. Are the students referred to in this proposal from

existing recruits or in addition to the number projected for next year?

V. Provencal – The project team has been working with recruiting to try to recruit new students but it is not possible to separate the two groups completely. Therefore some of these students may be part of the currently projected number of new students for next year. Those marketing Acadia to prospective students felt that it was appropriate to use this option to help recruit all students making it very difficult, and perhaps not appropriate, to separate the two groups. If more than 20 students choose the alternative first year it will be self financing. If fewer than 20 students choose the option it will not be offered.

S. Major – Since students must complete an additional application for the alternative project, it will be possible to know which students are truly interested. The Learning Commons will provide an evaluation to the Curriculum Committee as outlined in the proposal. Part of the evaluation will be to determine why the students chose Acadia.

A Quéma – Discussion of how this project is to be financed should not be taken as criticism of the concept. There are implications for using external funding for programs. This is a matter that should be debated at some point in the future.

The Chair indicated that this could be introduced as a discussion item at a future Senate meeting.

G. Whitehall – What method would the ‘systematic approach’ referred to on page 3 of the proposal take? Perhaps this evaluation should be done by a body external to the project.

S. Major – Although the Learning Commons has helped bring together the group to make the proposal the Commons is not a participant in the project. The Commons’ mandate to provide resources to enhance the quality of learning experiences and to explore new and innovative approaches to teaching makes it a natural place for the evaluation of this kind of initiative.

V. Provencal – The intention of the group is to do something that they hope will enrich what already exists at Acadia. It would be good to debate this alternative approach with the whole university community. This is why the alternative first year was proposed so that we can build on this project. We can discuss and debate this next year and determine if we want to move forward with it.

D Seamone spoke in favour of the motion and thanked the presenters for taking the time to bring this proposal before the three faculty councils as well as Senate.

It was moved by P. Williams and seconded by G. Whitehall that the current motion be amended to read *“The Senate Curriculum Committee hereby moves that the proposals for the six courses of Acadia’s First Year Alternative project and the Calendar description of this project be adopted on the understanding that Senate will receive an academic assessment of the project, a recruiting assessment of the project and an assessment of the financial impact of the project.”*

E. Callaghan - would a full budget be part of the financial impact assessment?

P. Williams – a financial assessment would include a full budget.

S. Major – a complete assessment of all aspects of the project cannot be done in time to make a decision regarding the recruitment value of the initiative.

M. Snyder – The three parts of the amendment could be conducted independently so with the recruitment aspect examined first.

AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

S. Major wanted it recorded that there was no presumption that the Learning Commons would be responsible for all aspects of the assessment that were listed in the amendment to the motion.

The Chair thanked those involved with framing the program.

V. Provencal thanked Senate for the debate.

b) Tenure-Track Teaching
Complement Allocation
Committee – December 08
Report (089-31-TCA)

P. Williams reported that the committee met and made recommendations following the process outlined in the report that Senate approved at the September meeting. He commended the Committee members for being non partisan in their voting. The process took into account the ranking provided by each faculty as well as metrics that considered the teaching loads, fce's and pedagogical differences among departments. (data attached). This level of analysis revealed that all departments are working on load or above.

A. Quema – did departments on the list see the criteria used? Did the results go to the departments?

P. Williams – The list was given to the Deans with ranking only with the detailed information is being seen for the first time today (**APPENDIX A**). Departments were not provided with a detailed assessment; members of the committee were divided on the wisdom of doing that.

A. Quema – Information presented at Senate does not always get disseminated to departments. The committee should consider how to make the process transparent.

P. Williams will take that back to the committee for their consideration.

4) New Business
a) Faculty of Arts -
Department of English
Renamed Department of
English and Theatre
(089-32-ART)

It was moved by P Rigg and seconded by B. Verstraete *'that the Department of English be renamed the Department of English and Theatre.'*

P Rigg spoke to the motion. This change of name will help bring clarity both within the university and to perspective students about the relationship between the two groups within the unit, both of whom offer degrees. The change is in name only and will not affect the structure of the department.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

b) Curriculum Committee –
Psychology Program:
Neuroscience Option
(089-33-CRE)

It was moved by R. Raeside and seconded by M. Snyder *that the Bachelor of Science with major in Psychology (Neuroscience Option) and the Bachelor of Science with Honours in Psychology (Neuroscience Option) as outlined in the Senate Agenda of 10 November 08 be approved.*

R. Raeside stated that the proposal was developed during the department's day long retreat last spring and includes courses that have been developed using gains in expertise in this area and in response to interest among students.

A. Quéma confirmed that the proposal was discussed by the Curriculum Committee and the Committee supports the motion.

A. Fougere confirmed that students see this as an excellent option and are pleased that the grouping of courses could be officially recognized.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

6) Adjournment

This meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

D. Murphy, Recording Secretary

	Faculty Ranking	FCE/TT Faculty	Normalised FCE Trend (x10 ⁻⁴)
Sociology – Culture and Ideology	1	90.6	+6.2
Chemistry – Inorganic Chemistry	1	79.4**	+9.2
Languages and Literatures – French Second-language Pedagogy and Sociolinguistics	2	58.2	-6.6
Manning School of Business Business Communication and Professional Development	1	83.8*	-5.03
Biology – Pre-health Sciences	2	59.4**	+1.14
Economics – Environmental Economics	3	91.9	+19
Sociology – Women/Gender/Feminism	4	90.6	+6.2
English – Literary Theory	5	55.8	-16.8
Business – Entrepreneurship	2	83.8*	-5.03
Computer Science – Environmental Informatics/Mobile & Embedded Computing	3	26	-50.3

*Ratio calculated taking into account previously authorized searches **Ratio including labs and instructors