



A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday, 8 June 2009 beginning at 9:00 am with Chair Ian Wilks presiding and 36 members present.

1) Minutes of the Meeting of
6 May 2009

It was moved by D. MacKinnon and seconded by R. Raeside *that the minutes of Wednesday, 6 May 2009 be approved as distributed.*

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2) Announcements and
Communications

a) From the Chair

-re Regrets

I. Wilks noted regrets from P. Corkum, J. Cottreau, E. Cullen, T. Hergett, A. Irving, M. MacVicar, R. Perrins, J. White and G. Whitehall.

-re Agenda

The following changes were made to the agenda: Item 4)b) became 3)a); and Item 5 - the TTTCAC had completed the work required to make the rankings. P. Williams would present the rankings and take questions.

I. Wilks acknowledged Senators whose term would end this year: M. Dennis, P. Doerr, R. Sparkman, R. Lehr, S. Markham-Starr, D. Symons, D. Julien, K. Steele, E. Cullen, R. Bishop, T. Hansen, M. Keaveny, S. Barron and B. Scott. G. Ness is retiring from the University.

-re Senate Membership

I. Wilks indicated that J. Hansen would no longer be the School of Music representative; J. Hennessy would be taking his place; he was welcomed to Senate.

-re Senate Executive
Meeting

I. Wilks reported that the Senate Executive met on two occasions, May 9 and 22, and was joined on both occasions by S. Major and G. Hepburn. The proposed Academic Technology Committee (Item 4)c)) was the result of those meetings.

b) From the President
& Vice-Chancellor
-re Patterson Hall

R. Ivany reported that the Federal/Provincial Infrastructure Program for the renovation of Patterson Hall is slow going at this time. This is in part because in Nova Scotia the provincial portion of the contribution is tied to a loan program that complicates the process. However, Acadia is progressing with this and the project will go before the Board of Governors when they meet in June.

-re Post Secondary
Education in N.S.

A review of post secondary education was part of the election platform of one provincial political party. The outcome of the election on June 9 will determine whether or not this goes forward. If it does, Senate would be involved with formulating our institutional response.

-re Alumni Association

The President has been meeting with alumni groups. The response has been very valuable for him and the institution. There have been good turn outs and a wide variety of Classes represented from the 1930's to very recent graduates. This is encouraging as the gatherings included some graduates that were willing to reengage with Acadia.

c) From the Vice-President
(Academic)
-re MA in Social & Political
Thought

The transdisciplinary MA in Social and Political Thought has gone to MPHEC with the hope that they will be able to deliberate on it before their summer break.

Dakin McDonald, a student of Senator D. Seamone, is the 2009 Canadian Society for the Study of Religion / Société canadienne pour l'étude de la religion Undergraduate Student Essay Contest winner. McDonald is a Political Science major. His success is of special note as he is completing his second year at Acadia and was competing against more senior students in the competition. His was also the only entry from a university that does not have a religious studies department. T. Herman congratulated both the student and his professor.

4) New Business
b) Vice-President (Academic)
- Elimination of Fall
Convocation (**089-86-VPA**)

There was no objection to moving to item 4)b).

It was moved by T. Herman, seconded by D. Seamone that Acadia University hold one convocation each year in May continuing the practice of three ceremonies. To accommodate students who complete their degree requirements between May and September and do not wish to wait until the following May to receive their degrees, Senate would approve the awarding of those degrees at its October meeting. Students who choose to graduate in October but wish to participate in a convocation ceremony will be invited to attend the Spring Convocation where they will have the opportunity for public recognition of their accomplishment.

As is the usual practice, the Registrar can provide a letter to students who have completed their course work noting that they have completed their requirements and that their name will be recommended to Senate for the awarding of the degree at the next

convocation. Graduate students who choose to receive their degree in October would be considered along with the May graduates for the Governor General's Gold Medal.

T. Herman spoke to the motion. Historically Fall Convocation has been a significant event, but attendance of both graduating students and faculty has been small in recent years. It is an expensive venture, with potential savings of \$20,000 if the ceremony does not go ahead. The arrangements outlined in the motion this time are different from last time when Senate was asked to consider eliminating Fall Convocation. Students are being invited to come back to campus the following May if they wish to participate in Convocation activities.

D. Seamone requested clarification on prizes and awards for undergraduate students. T. Herman confirmed that students who graduated in fall would be considered with the graduates the following spring for prizes and awards.

P. Hobson spoke against the motion. Although Fall Convocation is a smaller event it is important for the Acadia community as a whole and engages alumni and the wider community particularly when it is held on the same weekend as Homecoming. R. Bishop spoke in support of P. Hobson's position. P. Hobson indicated that if Fall Convocation was not well attended perhaps it was because the administration had failed to bring Convocation together properly. Dr. Dinter-Gottlieb's installation and the convocation where Dr. Margaret Conrad was honoured were examples of Fall Convocations that were very well attended and highly successful.

A. Quema – if attendance is low at this important event with great potential, what can be done to address this?

R. Sparkman – there are two issues, cost saving and attendance. He asked for clarification from the President regarding the cost savings.

R. Ivany stated that the \$20,000 mentioned is the amount of the direct saving that could be applied to other university costs.

A. Vibert indicated that the School of Education graduates would make up the largest group of affected students. Input has been solicited from education faculty by way of an email sent by R. Lehr. There have been several replies and none were opposed to the cancellation. Although support was tempered by regret at losing Fall Convocation, it seemed reasonable to cancel under the current circumstances with the need for fiscal restraint. Although many Master of Education students graduate in fall a large percentage of them are not able to attend the ceremony.

A. Mitchell - part of the issue is that some departments have few if any students that graduate in fall. Perhaps students could be recognized in a different way. T. Herman and R. Ivany agreed that

this would be possible. L. Lusby agreed that this might be a good approach; P. Hobson thought that no students would feel that a reception without convocation would warrant a return to Wolfville.

R. Raeside proposed a friendly amendment. The word 'graduation' should be added before 'convocation' in the first line of the motion. Both mover and seconder agreed.

D. Silver – is it possible to hold a less costly convocation? What are the major expenses? T. Herman – travel and accommodation expenses for the honorary degree recipient(s), food and printing accounted for the majority of the cost.

D. Symons - Departments should find ways to honour their graduates. Would this be a suspension for one year or a permanent change? T. Herman – this is intended to be a permanent change.

H. Kitchen – Is fall convocation referred to in the graduate calendar?

D. MacKinnon – only in the list of dates as in the undergraduate calendar.

C. Killacky – Is there somewhere else that the \$20,000 could be saved?

R. Ivany – The budget is still not finalized so there is still a need to look for savings; this is one of many difficult choices to be considered. There is sympathy for the role of Fall Convocation in the life of Acadia, but it is necessary to look at the entire budget to find all possible savings that will do minimal harm. Therefore this possibility must be looked at as well.

C. Killacky – Graduates from the Faculty of Theology tend to receive their degrees in absentia if they graduate in fall.

A. Quema – Perhaps fewer programs could be printed since there always seems to be a surplus. Perhaps there is a way to use technology to reduce the need for most of the printed programs at all future convocations.

The question was called.

*“...that Acadia University hold one **graduation** convocation each year in May continuing the practice of three ceremonies. To accommodate students who complete their degree requirements between May and September and do not wish to wait until the following May to receive their degrees, Senate would approve the awarding of those degrees at its October meeting. Students who choose to graduate in October but wish to participate in a convocation ceremony will be invited to attend the Spring Convocation where they will have the opportunity for public recognition of their accomplishment.*

As is the usual practice, the Registrar can provide a letter to students who have completed their course work noting that they have completed their requirements and that their name will be recommended to Senate for the awarding of the degree at the next convocation. Graduate students who choose to receive their degree in October would be considered along with the May graduates for the Governor General's Gold Medal."

MOTION AS AMENDED WAS CARRIED.

3) Business Arising from the Minutes

- a) By-Laws Committee -
Proposed Change to Senate
By-Laws as Related to the
Library Committee
(089-79-LIB)

It was moved by A. Quema, seconded by S. Lochhead *that the motion as presented at the May 6, 2009 meeting be approved.*

A. Quema spoke to the motion, explaining the rationale for each bullet.

S. Lochhead – the changes reflect the way the committee actually works – collaboratively, representing constituencies and supporting research.

P. Williams – should the document specify to whom the report is sent?

I. Wilks – as this is a Senate committee, reporting to Senate is implied.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

4) New Business

- a) Archives Committee -
Proposed Changes to By-
Laws in Relation to the
Archives Committee
(089-85-ARC)

Proposed Changes to By-Laws in Relation to the Archives Committee was presented as a notice of motion for the September meeting of Senate .

S. Lochhead – the Archives Committee is undergoing rejuvenation in much the same way as the Library Committee. The changes articulate the collaborative nature of the Committee that already exists. The changes are modeled on the changes to the Library Committee as both function in a very similar way.

- c) Senate Academic

Technologies Committee
(089-87-ATC)

I. Wilks – this is a request for a motion that will provide approval in principle to change the Constitution and By-Laws of Senate by adding a new standing committee as outlined in the document.as attached to today’s agenda.

It was moved by T. Herman, seconded by H. Hemming *that an Academic Technologies Committee of Senate be created.*

T. Herman – This proposal grew out of frustration voiced by faculty that they didn’t have an adequate say in technological changes that affected teaching and learning and that a closer link to Technology Services was needed. This is an attempt to provide a venue for dialogue between the providers of technology and faculty.

L. Lusby – This committee is badly needed. However, should the membership include more student representation? Perhaps one full and one part time student representing undergraduates and graduate students would be better.

I. Wilks voiced the concern that it is often difficult for logistical reasons to have graduate students serve on Senate committees as they are generally not selected for their post until later in the fall. This could slow the process.

L. Lusby – as long as there are more students on the committee it would be fine.

A. Quema – one representative from each faculty might be the best idea since the technology needs of each faculty are different.

A. Mitchell – There should be a requirement to consult annually as part of the committee’s mandate. There is a possibility for this in 3) but more specific wording would be of value since the required software for some courses may change every year making annual consultation valuable. It was found this year that not all software that was needed in some courses worked equally well on all the hardware that students were using. R. Sparkman agreed with this assessment.

D. Symons – Perhaps Senate as a whole should follow the same process in creating committees that departments must follow when presenting new course proposals. If a course is added, one must be dropped. Is it possible that an existing Senate committee could be used rather than creating this new committee by changing the mandate of an existing committee in some way?

D. Silver – The mandate of this new committee gives it an oversight role in relation to the Director of Technology Services. Perhaps it would be best to wait for that person to be appointed.

D. Seamone – Agreed with D. Symons about the proliferation of

Senate committees. However, this is making a Senate committee from one that was not a Senate committee before. The committee should be formed without delay before the Director of Technology Services is appointed.

I. Wilks – As background to the discussion, the AA 2.0 committee had terms of reference that were too broad. Therefore that committee was disbanded with this new committee formed under the aegis of Senate.

G. Hepburn – The committee will not be led by the Director of Technology Services but will provide advice to that person, therefore there is no reason to wait.

A. Mitchell – Amend the mandate of the committee by adding as bullet 4 – “to consult annually with representatives of programs, departments and schools regarding their computing needs.”

L. Lusby – The membership should be amended to read “one student from each faculty”.

I. Wilks – Having three students might cause a problem for quorum if the students are not available during the summer.

A. Quema – Students need to be heard. Their issues with technology impact courses and evaluations. Unless there is a student from each of the faculties, students may not feel that their particular issues are well represented.

C. Killacky – The Faculty of Theology would not require a permanent student member; ADC struggles to meet the need for students to serve on existing committees. Perhaps invite a student from Theology on an ad hoc basis.

L. Lusby – There should be one student from each of the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science.

D. Seamone – If there is concern about quorum during the summer perhaps only one of the student members should be a voting member.

L. Lusby – Perhaps the problem is more perceived than real. There seem to be lots of students on campus during the summer months including the members of the ASU executive.

D. Symons – The SRC knows who is around and will choose members accordingly.

It was moved by L. Lusby, seconded by A. Quema, *that there be one student representative from each of the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science.*

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

G. Hepburn - Perhaps student input could be solicited without having more student members on the committee. Sometimes on the AA 2.0 committee there was a leakage of issues around technology that was not part of the committee's mandate. There are three levels of issues related to technology: day to day issues that would likely not come before the committee, issues that come to the committee that the committee could resolve, issues that are more complicated and would need to come to Senate.

P. Williams – the relationship of faculty to the Director of Technology Services recently has been difficult at times. This committee should provide advice to that position rather than be lead by it.

C. Shields – The quorum of the committee should become six with the addition of members.

L. Lusby – this will go to the By Laws Committee. This motion is to approve in principle. Concerns could be sent there for consideration and recommendations.

I. Wilks – Policy concerns need to be resolved at Senate not by the By Laws Committee.

A. Quema – Will this committee if formed meet this summer?

I. Wilks – No. The committee will not be formally constituted unless there is a July Senate meeting.

A. Quema – Can the committee be approved in principle and start addressing questions that are urgent? Can approval to work immediately be granted?

I. Wilks – No. If needed, perhaps the AA 2.0 Committee can take up the problems.

The question was called.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The revised terms of reference and composition of the committee:

Membership:

Vice-President Academic

Coordinator, Academic Technologies (Sheldon L. Fountain Learning Commons)

One elected faculty representative from each of the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science

One elected librarian

One student from each of the Faculties of Arts, Pure and Applied Science and Professional Studies

Director of Technology Services

Director of Open Acadia

The Chair of the Senate Academic Technologies Committee will be elected by the committee members. Quorum for the committee's meetings will be **six** members of the committee.

Mandate:

1) To develop and submit policy recommendations to Senate regarding the infrastructure and service support needs of faculty, staff, and students related to academic technologies.

2) To advocate through Senate for appropriate resources for academic technologies.

3) To address academic concerns regarding academic technologies on campus by making recommendations to the Director of Technology Services and where appropriate by making motions for consideration by Senate.

4) To consult annually with representatives of programs, departments, and schools regarding their computing needs.

5) To submit an annual report to Senate detailing the committee's activities.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

d) Acadia Divinity College -
Course Changes
(089-88-ADC)

It was moved by H. Gardener, seconded by C. Killacky *that the motions put forward by the Acadia Divinity College for curriculum changes within the Faculty of Theology as attached to today's agenda be approved.*

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

5) Other Business

a) Tenure Track Teaching
Complement Allocation
Committee - Report on
Ranking (089-89-TCA)

P. Williams – The Committee was able to move forward the timing of its deliberations so the ranked list is now available. The criteria used were the same as last year. Senators requested feedback on the process, so the committee went out through the Deans who sit on the committee to acquire this information. Committee members put the best interests of the university ahead of their individual units.

P. Rigg – How does the committee change the ranking from that submitted by each faculty?

P. Williams – The committee does not make changes. He will confirm the rankings and provide an accurate list to the Chair to

email to all Senators today. As comments concerning the process are received, the Committee will debrief and discuss their process.

D. Symons – It is possible that the number of positions searched for may be 0. Is it a concern that with this elaborate process it could be that no positions would be posted?

P. Williams – By following this process it gives a clearer picture of what is happening with positions across campus. The Committee is not given any information about the number of positions for the year.

T. Herman – The number of positions to be posted is not available at this time. However, the process seems to work well. There is an understanding of the frustration created by not filling all positions.

P. Williams – Senate would need to change the Committee's mandate if it felt that an annual list was not to be created.

6) Adjournment

R. Karsten moved this meeting be adjourned. It was 12:15 p.m.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Jotcham, Recording Secretary