



A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University was held on Monday, May 12, 2010 beginning at 9:05 pm with Chair Ian Wilks presiding and 34 members present.

1) Minutes of the meeting of
April 12, 2010

It was moved by R. Raeside, seconded by D. MacKinnon that the minutes of the meeting of Monday April 12, 2010 be approved as distributed.

The following amendments were made:

Page 5 Item 3f) "*Dr. Pat Corkum*" should read "*Prof. Pat Corkum*"
Page 7 Item 3i) "*assured Senate that the one- and two-day courses are of sufficient duration to be assigned 1 credit hour and 2 credit hours respectively*" should read "*assured Senate that a two-day course is of sufficient duration to be assigned one credit hour*"

MOTION AS AMENDED WAS CARRIED

2) Announcements and
Communications

a) From the Chair
Re regrets

Regrets were received from A. Irving, J. Eustace, H. Hemming, J. Hennessy, M. MacVicar, S. Markham-Staff, R. Murphy, R. Perrins, and E. Smith.

The Chair welcomed Lisa Davidson, Assistant Registrar; Dr. Paul Callaghan, Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee and Dr. Bruce Fawcett, Acadia Divinity College as guests to the meeting.

Re: Agenda

The following additions were made to the agenda:
Item 5f) Notice of Motion ~ Faculty Elections Officer
Senate Committee Annual Reports:
5e) xvi. Board of Open Acadia
5e) xvii Senate Executive
5e) xviii. Senate Research Committee

Re: June meeting
of Senate

The Chair announced that a meeting of Senate would be held on June 16, 2010 at 9:00 am.

- b) From the
President and
Vice-Chancellor

President Ivany informed Senate that the draft report of the O'Neill Review is expected at the end of May, with the final report due at the end of June.

President Ivany reported that other small universities are being invited to join with Acadia in making a submission to NSERC and SSHRC outlining the concerns about the impact that decisions made by the granting councils are having on scholarly research at smaller universities.

- c) From the Vice-
President Academic

T. Herman informed Senate that the Acadia website now contains a "Research" button and thanked Dr. D. MacKinnon for his efforts in ensuring that information about Acadia research is publicly available on the website.

- 3) Approval of the List of
Graduates for the
Convocation of
May 2010

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by R. Cunningham that *the list of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2010 (APPENDIX A) be approved as distributed.*

The list of graduates was reviewed by section.

MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by R. Cunningham that *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 forthcoming Convocation, shall be considered by the Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee, the appropriate Dean and the Registrar, acting as an ad hoc committee of Senate, they having the power to make consequential amendments to the graduation list.*

MOTION CARRIED

- 4) Business arising from the
Minutes

- a) Motion regarding the
Membership of the
Chair of the Senate
Curriculum Committee
on the Senate Graduate
Studies Committee

It was moved by A. Quema and seconded by D. MacKinnon that

According to According to the Senate By-Laws, the duties of the

Graduate Studies Committee include the following: "To consider graduate curriculum submissions from Departments, Schools and Faculties and to make recommendations to Senate. Such submissions include changes in existing programs, courses and degree requirements and proposals for new courses, degree requirements and programs" (VIII, ii, b).

On this basis, the Senate Curriculum Committee moves that its chair be an ad-hoc member of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee for the purpose of ensuring coordination in curriculum course proposals where undergraduate courses are also offered as graduate courses.

A. Quema spoke on behalf of the Curriculum Committee stating that the motion originally came before Senate in March and was tabled. The motion is intended to ensure coordination between courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels.

MOTION CARRIED

The Chair indicated that the passing of the motion could serve as notice of motion for the resulting change in wording in the Constitution and By-Laws, which will be brought to the June meeting of Senate.

With the agreement of Senate, Item 4b) was held over until later in the meeting.

- c) Motion regarding the Process of Nomination and Election for Faculty

It was moved by P. Williams and seconded by D. Seamone that

In order to further enhance the openness and transparency of Senate, it is proposed that the Process of Nomination and Election for Faculty used by the Nominating Committee, found in VIII. (b) ii, which currently reads,

In carrying out its responsibilities, the Nominating Committee shall:

- a. Review qualifications for vacant positions and determine potential candidates based on their availability, other committee loads, administrative loads, interests, etc.;*
- b. Invite candidates to serve until one agrees;*
- c. Present its nominations to Senate where additional nominations will be invited. Either Senate will confirm the nominations or an election will be held if additional nominations are put forward.*

be amended to read

In carrying out its responsibilities, the Nominating Committee shall:

- a. Issue a call for nominations from eligible members for all vacant positions. All nominations must be accompanied by an agreement to serve if elected.*
- b. In a case where no nominations are forthcoming, or if the Committee so desires, determine potential candidates based on their qualifications, availability, other committee loads, administrative loads, interests, etc.*
- c. Whenever possible, present a slate of nominations to Senate where final nominations will be accepted and an election will be held. Nominees may submit a short statement outlining their interest in and relevant experience/expertise for a position.*

P. Williams spoke to the motion, explaining that issuing a public call for nominations makes the nomination process more open and that the existing function of the Nominating Committee would be preserved.

P. Callaghan explained that the vast majority of nominations to fill vacancies come forward from the Faculties, with less than 8% or 20 positions being nominated through the Nominating Committee.

A. Quema suggested that the publicizing of vacancies should also occur within the Faculties. Concern was expressed that the motion removes from the Nominating Committee the role of reviewing candidates' qualifications.

A. Mitchell suggested that the Nominating Committee distribute committee work in an equitable manner and ensure the involvement of young faculty.

R. Cunningham supported the motion as it facilitates greater transparency in the nominating process.

D. Seamone suggested that nominators are reviewing the qualifications of candidates before they put names forward for consideration.

Discussion surrounded whether the Nominating Committee should be responsible for reviewing the qualifications of nominees.

P. Williams stated that an open call for nominations is an important element of the democratic process and that a call from the floor is not adequate, especially for the Chair of Senate.

A. Mitchell noted that the proposed process would result in a greater number of elections on the floor of Senate and questioned the role of the Nominating Committee.

P. Corkum noted that a public call for nominations would provide an opportunity for additional names to be added to the list of potential members. The Nominating Committee is responsible for filling the lay positions on Senate and that a public call for nominations would also apply to these positions.

A friendly amendment was accepted and is reflected in the motion above.

MOTION CARRIED.

d) Report from the
Senate By-Laws
Committee regarding
the Research
Ethics Board

It was moved by P. Corkum and seconded by A. Quema that

The proposed revised By-Laws [Appendix B] concerning the Research Ethics Board's membership, selection of membership, quorum, and duties be approved.

P. Corkum spoke to the motion stating that the proposed revision to the By-Laws reflects the expectations set forward in the draft 2nd edition of the Tri-Council policy statement and promotes accountability and training, both when members are new to the Board and throughout their tenure. The proposed turnover in membership provides an opportunity for exposure and training for a greater number of faculty. The motion proposes that a member from the Faculty of Theology be on the Board, that the quorum for meetings be five voting members, that the selection process for faculty members be by Faculty as it is for other Senate Standing Committees, and that there be two community members, one of whom shall possess legal knowledge. The Nominating Committee will be responsible for the call for nominations for lay members. The Chair is to be a faculty member who is knowledgeable in ethics. The motion also outlines the requirements for the Research Ethics Board annual report to Senate.

D. MacKinnon thanked the By-Laws Committee for their thorough review and noted that the Research Ethics Board reports independently to Senate. He welcomed representation from the Faculty of Theology. It was noted that the Chair should be an experienced member of the Committee as the role is a demanding one and would be difficult for a new member.

C. Shields stated that the Chair should possess an in-depth knowledge of policies and procedures as well as ethics experience.

In response to a question from C. Shields, W. Brackney stated

that precedent exists for Faculty of Theology representation on the Research Ethics Board and that projects undertaken at the Divinity College may be of interest to the Research Ethics Board.

In response to a concern expressed by R. Cunningham, C. Killacky and W. Brackney stated that no conflict exists between faith and research ethics as the role of a member of the Research Ethics Board is to ensure that proper research standards, methodology and protocols are met.

In response to a question from C. Shields about whether research conducted at the Acadia Divinity College should come before the Research Ethics Board, C. Killacky stated that the Senate of the Acadia Divinity College should address the issue.

D. MacKinnon noted that vacancies exist on the Research Ethics Board for representatives from the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science.

Discussion surrounded the wording that the membership of the Research Ethics Board shall include *“both men and women”*.

MOTION CARRIED with 1 opposed.

5. New Business

a) Report of the Nominating Committee

It was moved by A. Quema and seconded by M. Corbett that the list of nominations be approved.

P. Callaghan noted that some vacancies remain for Senate as well as on Senate committees.

W. Brackney will be the Faculty of Theology representative on the By-Laws Committee.

The Chair called for further nominations from the floor. As a further nomination for Chair of Senate was received, voting by secret ballot took place. P. Corkum was elected to the position of Chair of Senate for 2010/11.

b) Notice of Motion – Certain Duties of Chair and Deputy Chair

P. Corkum spoke to the motion, which provides the Chair the opportunity to delegate certain duties to the Deputy Chair and addresses the need to increase awareness surrounding the nomination and election processes.

A friendly amendment was suggested striking the words *“prior to the first Fall meeting of Senate”* from the motion.

D. Seamone noted that the Deputy Chair is not currently a member of the Senate Executive Committee. I. Wilks noted that a change in the membership of the Senate Executive might require a change to the Act of Incorporation, which would not be within the purview of Senate. He suggested that the By-Laws Committee examine the Act to determine whether Senate can alter the membership of the Executive. It was suggested that the Deputy Chair as well as student representatives could be invited to attend Senate Executive meetings as guests.

In response to a suggestion from M. Trask that Board of Governor representatives be invited to attend the orientation sessions, it was noted that the sessions occur in September before the Board representatives are selected at their annual meeting in October.

President Ivany suggested that he and the Secretary to the Board of Governors and Senate could bring forward the suggestion that the Board align their Senate representative selection process with the Senate year.

c) Notice of Motion –
Nominating
Committee

P. Corkum spoke to the motion stating that it addresses ambiguities in the By-Laws and changes the dates for the election of the Chair and Deputy Chair of Senate.

d) Curriculum
Committee

The submissions circulated with the agenda were reviewed. It was moved by A. Quema and seconded by B. Anderson that the curriculum changes be approved.

MOTION CARRIED.

f) Notice of Motion --
Faculty Elections
Officer

P. Corkum presented the motion, the purpose of which is to add certain elections to the duties of the Faculty Elections Officer.

4 b) Discussion regarding an
Alternative System of
External Reading for
Honours Theses

D. Holmberg provided a background to the discussion noting that a motion to remove the external reader as a requirement for honours theses was defeated at the March meeting of Senate. At that meeting, it was suggested that the Honours Committee discuss alternatives for improving the quality of theses and a discussion paper presenting two alternatives had been circulated to Senators prior to the April meeting of Senate.

D. MacKinnon explained that the external reader is reading for form and style to determine if the thesis is well-presented. The Honours Committee conducted a trial process whereby the first 10-20 pages of a thesis were reviewed with the thesis being returned if there was a problem. The Committee plans to meet in September to review the process.

D. Seamone stated that there is value in the second reader being external to the department as the process provides a mechanism to improve the quality of Acadia theses. Cross-departmental reading is also of value given the interdisciplinary courses at Acadia.

P. Rigg supported the external reader process as it provides an element of quality control and polish to the theses, which are published and reflect on students, faculty and the institution.

A. Quema suggested that the issue be discussed within the Faculties for greater input.

C. Shields noted that the role of an external reader is to ensure that a thesis reads coherently. Those who are not knowledgeable in the subject area are hesitant to make substantive comments.

T. Herman stated that as Acadia theses are viewed as emanating from the University, rigour in their review is essential. The quality of the theses as well as the interaction between faculty and students is part of what distinguishes Acadia.

D. MacKinnon recognized that the review process is important and suggested that the Deans and Directors address the issue of the difficulty in finding external reviewers.

D. Holmberg suggested that a list of standards and expectations for Acadia theses would be useful. The 3-4 weeks needed for the external reader process could be better utilized by a second reader who could contribute substantively to the thesis. The motion removed the requirement for an external reader but the option remained.

J. Banks cautioned that editing must be light so that a thesis retains the voice of the student.

G. Whitehead noted that during the March meeting of Senate, the student representative from the Faculty of Arts had mentioned that quality suffers when students are rushed to finish a thesis. He suggested that rules of engagement may be required to outline the role of the second reader. Senate may wish to consider sponsoring an open forum for the discussion so that the conversation is broader than ones that would be held within individual Faculties.

A. Vibert suggested that each Faculty identify those faculty who are able to act as external reviewers and that the work be formally recognized.

President Ivany expressed his thanks for the depth and rigour of the discussion and supported the concept of a Senate-sponsored forum.

T. Herman offered his assistance in organizing the forum.

A. Quema suggested that a member from each Faculty and a student Senate representative craft a motion outlining the mechanism for a Senate-sponsored forum to be discussed at the June meeting of Senate.

5) Senate Committee
Annual Reports

Tabled.

6) Adjournment

J. Banks moved the meeting be adjourned at 11:50 am.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

K. Slater Padovani, Recording Secretary

APPENDIX A

Available on Request

APPENDIX B- PROPOSED REVISED BY-LAWS

If approved, the various Senate committees affected will be revised as indicated below:

VIII. (g) RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD * ***

i. The Research Ethics Board (REB) **(a standing committee of Senate)** shall be an independent board. ~~whose membership, except for the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, and the graduate student representative, both of whom are non-voting members, shall be nominated by the Senate Research Committee, and elected by Senate. The Research Ethics Board shall report to Senate through the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies. All members (aside from the graduate student representative) shall be appointed for up to a three-year term. The graduate student representative shall be appointed for a one-year term.~~

Membership of the Research Ethics Board **(including both men and women)** shall be as follows:

Non-voting members:

The Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, who shall act as liaison to the Senate Research Committee, the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, and Senate;

One graduate student, who shall be appointed by the Student Representative Council.

Voting members

One faculty member, knowledgeable in ethics, to serve as Chair;

One member from the Faculty of Arts with broad expertise in the methods or in the areas of research that are covered by the REB;

One member from the Faculty of Professional Studies with broad expertise in the methods or in the areas of research that are covered by the REB;

One member from the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science with broad expertise in the methods or in the areas of research that are covered by the REB;

One member from the Faculty of Theology with broad expertise in the methods or in the areas of research that are covered by the REB;

One ~~or two member(s)~~ member from the community with no affiliation to Acadia University **and not currently engaged in scientific, legal or academic work.**

One member from the community who has legal knowledge, but with no affiliation with Acadia University;

ii. The duties of the Research Ethics Board shall be:

- The REB shall adopt, interpret and implement the principles, protocols and procedures outlined in the Tri-Council Policy Statement, "Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans," as they pertain to the types of research and related activity conducted by employees, faculty, students and researchers associated with Acadia University.

- The REB shall establish and supervise a process to review research proposals referred to it in a regular and timely manner so that researchers are not compromised in their ability to initiate their research programmes. The Research Ethics Board shall approve, reject, propose modifications to, or terminate any proposed or ongoing research involving human subjects which is conducted within, or by members of, Acadia University, using considerations set forth in the Tri-Council Policy Statement, "ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans."
- The REB shall communicate the Tri-Council Policy Statement and its implications (and any future modifications to the Tri-Council Policy Statement) to all employees, faculty, students and researchers associated with Acadia University.
- In accord with provisions provided by the Tri-Council Secretariat, Acadia University's REB shall serve in a reciprocal relation, acting as the Appeal Board for Mount Allison University's REB.
- The REB shall provide to Senate, through **its Chair** ~~the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies~~, an annual report of its activities. **The report should address**
 - ◆ **Its policies for the training of members, appointment of Ad Hoc advisors, and other key operating decisions as required by the TCPS and implemented by the REB, and**
 - ◆ **appeals, complaints, interpretive matters for which the REB has sought guidance from the Canadian Secretariat on Research Ethics, and any other matters out of the ordinary with which the Board has dealt with over the reported period**
- The REB shall consider such matters as may from time to time be referred to it.
- iii Quorum for meetings of the Research Ethics Board shall be set at ~~four~~ five voting members, one of which must be one of the two community members.

VIII. (f) RESEARCH COMMITTEE

ii. The duties of the Research Committee shall be:

- ~~a. To nominate members to the Research Ethics Board in accordance with VIII.(g).i.~~

VIII. (q) FACULTY ELECTIONS OFFICER

- i. The Faculty Elections Officer at large shall be elected annually by Senate on nomination by the Nominating Committee of Senate. This position is to be distinguished from the Faculty Election Officers within each Faculty. **
- ii. The duties of the Faculty Elections Officer shall be:
 - to conduct, the election of the Faculty member, knowledgeable in ethics, to serve as Chair of the Research Ethics Board, a standing committee of Senate.