Office of the Senate Secretariat

Acadia University Wolfville, Nova Scotia Canada B0P 1X0



Telephone: (902) 585-1617 Facsimile: (902) 585-1078

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday February 8, 2010 beginning at 4:10pm with Chair Ian Wilks presiding and 36 members present.

1)		nutes of the meeting of nuary 11, 2010	It was moved by P. Hobson, seconded by W. Brackney that the minutes of the meeting of Monday January 11, 2010 be approved as distributed.
	_		Item 5 b) was corrected to read 'J. Eustace questioned' MOTION CARRIED AS AMENDED.
2)	Co	nouncements and mmunications From the Chair	
		Re regrets -	Regrets were received from A. Irving, M. Trask, T. Hergett, S. Markham-Starr, B. Hagerman, R. Murphy, R. Wehrell, H. Gardner, M. Corbett, J. Banks
		Re visitors -	Observers W. Guthro, K. Power, K. Padovani and A. Starkman were welcomed to the meeting. K. Padovani was introduced as the recently appointed recording secretary for Senate and the Board of Governors.
		Re agenda -	Several notices of motion are found in the agenda. If notice is waived, these could be voted on at this meeting.
	b)	From the President And Vice- Chancellor	A review of the university sector is underway in Nova Scotia. This has been anticipated since the new government took office last year. It is difficult to tell how extensive the review will be at this time. It may focus on positions that will be incorporated into the next MOU

between the universities and the province or it may be much broader. President Ivany will meet with Dr O'Neill on Wednesday. President Ivany will be updating the Deans next week.

In response to a question from J. Eustace, it was confirmed that at the moment S. Lochhead reports directly to the President in her dual role of Vice President of Student Services and University Librarian. When a single individual does not hold both positions, the University Librarian will report to the Vice President Academic.

c) From the Vice

President Academic

Academic program reviews are moving forward. The reviews of the School of Recreation Management and Kinesiology as well as the Department of English and Theatre are complete and the reports are pending. The review of the School of Business is scheduled for March 1 and 2. The review of the Department of Languages and Literatures will be conducted on March 10 and 11. The complete cycle of reviews for all academic units should be completed during the 2010-11 academic year. This is slightly ahead of schedule.

The current exhibition at the Art Gallery features 140 works by community members, alumni, students and staff and features a very impressive collection of works. The opening was attended by nearly 200 people.

The School of Music's new music event 'Shattering the Silence' showcased an impressive array of talent providing our students with a larger audience from the music community and interested citizens from the local area. The performance level for this event was very high.

The School of Computer Science hosted the 5th annual robot programming competition, which this year involved teams representing 43 junior and senior high schools – the largest number to date. The competition was awarded a NSERC science promotion award.

A new open access peer-reviewed journal has been launched through the Public Knowledge Network with S. Markham-Starr as managing editor. A number of grants awarded to faculty members were mentioned as well as AAAU awards.

R. Cunningham requested an indication of when the report from the review committee for the Department of English and Theatre could be expected. T. Herman acknowledged that the timing for past reports varied from one week to five months, but the norm was about 4 to 6 weeks. G. Whitehall asked for clarification regarding the selection process for the eighth Canada Research Chair. T. Herman outlined the process whereby all the proposals were considered and a short list of two was created. Those two were invited to make presentations to the selection committee. The choice was a hard one, but it was felt that the proposal that was not selected had a very good chance of funding from an alternate source and the recommendation was made that this funding be pursued through Research and Graduate Studies.

P. Hobson asked whether the lack of start up grants for new faculty will impact their research and the ability for Acadia to recruit. T. Herman acknowledged that this is a concern and hopefully this is a temporary situation. He has discussed this with the candidates when they meet him as part of the interview process and the response from candidates has been varied.

- Business Arising from the Minutes
 - a) Notice of Motion (910-44-END)

Notice of Motion was waived. It was moved by A. Mitchell, Seconded by J. Eustace that Whereas Acadia University received a substantial gift approximately 10 years ago for the purpose of establishing the Foulis Chair in Engineering and no chair has yet been created, I move that the Chair of Senate be directed to write to the Secretary of the Board of Governors of Acadia University expressing concern over the delay in carrying out this Donor's wishes and requesting information regarding future plans for the establishment of a Chair. I would further ask the Senate Chair to request that the Board (if it has not done so already) develop a long range management plan for the Foulis endowment that is designed to generate a stable income to support the Chair, and share with us Senate the details of what that anticipated income might be and when it is expected to become available. D. Holmberg offered a friendly amendment changing 'us' to

'Senate'. MOTION CARRIED AS AMENDED

4) New Business a) Curriculum Committee A. Quéma reviewed the process that the Curriculum (910-45-CRE) Committee used while considering the submissions from academic units. (Appendix A). Minutes for the Committee's meetings are available. The Committee is working on changes to the curriculum forms. Some suggestions from faculty have already been received; additional suggestions are welcome. The submissions circulated with the agenda were reviewed; a number of changes were made. It was moved by T. Herman, seconded by J. Hennessey that the curriculum changes from the Faculty of Arts be approved as amended. MOTION CARRIED. It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by R. Raeside that the curriculum changes proposed by the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science be approved as amended. MOTION CARRIED. It was moved by H. Hemming and seconded by D. MacKinnon that the curriculum changes from the Faculty of Professional Studies be approved. MOTION CARRIED. b) Minors on the Academic Record The motion was held over. (910-41-CCT) c) Motion from Research and Graduate Studies It was moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by W. Brackney

(910-46-REB)	that the recommendations of Research and Graduate
	Studies for appointments to the Research Ethics Board as
	outlined in the attachment be approved.

H. Kitchen requested an explanation regarding the method used for appointments to this Board as it differs from the election process that is normally used for committees. The Chair explained that the procedure for appointments was laid out when the Board was formed. Changes in the process may be possible or it may be the case that the process is laid out by the Tri Council and not something that can be changed by Senate. If it is established that Senate is able to change the method of appointment a motion could be brought forward with recommended changes.

It was moved by D. Seamone, seconded by C. Shields that the motion be tabled pending further consideration of the process for selection of Board members. MOTION CARRIED.

d) Honorary Degrees Committee (910-47-HOD)

R. Ivany reviewed the process by which nominations for honorary degree recipients and professors emeriti were made and gave a brief introduction to each candidate. This was followed by a secret ballot vote and the approval of all the candidates.

5) Other business	A. Quéma introduced the notices of motion from the
(910-48-CRE)	Curriculum Committee.
(910-49-CRE; 910-50-GR	2D)
(910-51-CRE)	

6) Adjournment	Quorum was lost so the Chair declared the meeting
	adjourned.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Jotcham, Recording Secretary (Acting)

APPENDIX A Senate Minutes/8February10/Item 4)a) (910-45-CRE)

SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE: DUTIES AND PROCESS

The following is a delineation of the process in which the Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC) engages when it performs its tasks and duties.

VIII. (c) ii. The duties of the Curriculum Committee shall be:

a. To consider recommendations from any Faculty, Department or School for

changes in its degree, certificate, or diploma regulations and make recommendations to Senate; b. To initiate and make recommendations concerning changes in the curriculum; in particular, to make recommendations concerning the requirements for any degree;

c. To consider curriculum changes which may be made necessary by changes in secondary school matriculation standards;

d. To consider submissions from all Departments, Schools, or from any individual, concerning changes in the curriculum;

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

Membership

1 Registrar or Delegate (Non-vote) R. Jotcham ex-officio --

1 Librarian or Delegate S. Lochhead ex-officio: Erin Patterson

1 Arts P. Rigg 3 yr 2010

1 Arts A. Quéma 3 yr 2011

1 Prof. St. D. Piper 3 yr 2012

1 Prof. St. I. Feltmate 3 yr 2011 P. Callaghan

1 P&A Sc. R. Raeside 3 yr 2012

1 P&A Sc. E. Curry 3 yr 2010

1 Student (VP Academic) Emma Cullen 1 yr 2010

1 Student Julia Turner 1 yr 2010

Process

1) <u>Forms</u>

Collection of curriculum forms. The forms can be found at <u>http://central.acadiau.ca/registrar/</u> There are five types of form: new program; new course; modification to a program; modification to a course; deletion of a course

Since there are ten members on the SCC, we require10 copies.

2) Meetings

Out of four meetings this year, the SCC devoted three meetings to curriculum proposals: December 11, 2009; December 14, 2009; and January 27, 2010

Agendas and minutes are all available.

The calendar of the Committee's activities is in large part determined by the deadline for submitting curriculum forms (December 1, 2009) and the February Senate meeting when Senators are requested to approve curriculum proposals. During this period, committee members

review the forms, the Chair consults faculty members (before and after the Christmas break), and the Registrar prepares a synthesis of all the curriculum matters to be discussed and presented at Senate.

3) Review of the curriculum proposals

- The analysis is based on three basic criteria: the duties spelled out by the by-laws, criteria set by the forms, and faculty's academic freedom to determine the contents and modes of delivery of courses and programs. In the reviewing process, the SCC strives to strike a balance between these three criteria in order to achieve consistency with the rest of the Calendar's terminology as well as coherence within established programs.
- The criteria set by the forms are not written in stone, and faculty members are invited to make suggestions for changes (no need to fill a form to change the forms).
- New programs have to be approved by the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission. The Commission's site can be viewed at http://www.mphec.ca/
- The SCC must bear in mind the readership of the Calendar: students are the primary readers and users of the document, but other readers include program reviewers and colleagues at universities in Canada and abroad.
- The main objective of the SCC's review is to identify and record problems which curriculum proposals might present. The Committee's member who takes minutes (this year, Dr. Raeside) is responsible for cataloguing these problems as the Committee deliberates. After the meeting, both the Registrar and the Chair identify other possible problems and omissions. The Chair produces a report tracking all the identified problems and makes this report available to the Committee's members. This allows for close monitoring of the tasks and for making the Chair accountable to the Committee's members.

4) Problem-solving

Chair's pilgrimage to different locations on campus to discuss forms with faculty. The objective is to find a solution to whatever problem has been identified. This is an exercise in dialogue and collaboration.

5) <u>Registrar's synthesis</u>

The Registrar produces a major synthesis which is submitted to the SCC for approval. Invariably, it is the object of sustained and necessary proofreading sessions between the Registrar and the Chair. This year, the document is 55 pages long.

6) <u>Recommendation to Senate for approval</u> Presentation of the Registrar's synthesis.

APPENDIX A Senate Minutes/8February10/Item 4)a) – Page 3 (910-45-CRE)

7) Motions

In the course of its deliberations, the SCC may identify general issues pertaining to curriculum issues. Also, while interacting with faculty members, the Chair may receive suggestions for changes to curriculum procedures, or general aspects of the Calendar. This year, three motions have been prepared in response to discussion on the SSC and to faculty's suggestions.