



A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Wednesday, 11 May 2011 beginning at 9:00 am. with Chair Patricia Corkum presiding and 39 present.

- 1) Minutes of the Meeting of 11 April 2011
- It was moved by R. Cunningham and seconded by W. Slight *that the minutes of Monday, 11 April 2011 be approved.*

MOTION CARRIED.

- 2) Announcements
- a) From the Chair of Senate
- Regrets were received from W. Brackney, C. Deal, W. Elliott, S. Hewitt, J. Holt, B. Latta, and J. Whidden.

The Chair welcomed as a guest to Senate Gillian Poulter as a Faculty of Arts Senator effective July 1, 2011. She also welcomed Aaron Knock, student representative from the Faculty of Theology and the President of the Acadia Divinity College Students Association. Student representatives Sarah Sweet and Ben Jessome were also acknowledged.

- b) From the President and Vice-Chancellor

President Ivany reported that the MOU discussions between the university sector and the province had begun. The CONSUP Negotiating Committee, of which President Ivany is a member, will meet with government on June 9<sup>th</sup>.

In response to a question from R. Cunningham about the possible sale of university-owned properties on Westwood Avenue, D. Youden noted that any decision to sell properties is the purview of the Board of Governors and that a process for sale has not been determined. R. Cunningham suggested that the Acadia community be made aware of properties for sale before the information is publicly available.

- c) From the Vice President Academic

T. Herman reminded Senators to forward to his office any concerns surrounding the bookstore meeting the academic needs of the university.

T. Herman announced that Linda Lusby was recently honoured by receiving the Campus Environment Leadership Award from the Environmental and Sustainability Studies Student Society, which is awarded to a person who has demonstrated dedication to environmental initiatives on campus. A tree will be planted in her name adjacent to the Acadia Farm. T. Herman also acknowledged Prof. Lusby's outstanding commitment to students within the Environmental Science Program.

A moment of silence was observed for the late Dr. John Davies, who had retired from the Department of Economics in January. P. Corkum informed Senators that prior to his passing, Dr. Davies received word that Senate had awarded to him the Professor Emeritus designation.

- 3) New Business  
a) Approval of the List of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2011

It was moved by B. Jessome and seconded by J. Best that *the list of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2011 (APPENDIX A) be approved as distributed.*

The list of graduates, which was approved at the Faculty Council meeting of May 10, 2011, was reviewed by section. There was one addition and one deletion for the Faculty of Arts and two additions for the Faculty of Professional Studies.

In response to a question from D. Silver concerning students with a second major, R. Jotcham noted that these students are listed on the program evaluation for both departments to confirm that the students have met the requirements in each program area and are eligible to appear on the list of graduates that appears in the Convocation programme.

In response to a question from K. Power concerning the number of students who were removed from the list of graduates due to outstanding financial accounts, R. Jotcham reported that one student was so removed and another was removed because academic grades had not been received for a course taken at another institution. R. Jotcham confirmed that both the students and the institution had been contacted.

MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by R. Murphy 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.

- b) Honorary Degrees Committee  
i. Amendment to Procedures and Criteria

It was moved by President Ivany and seconded by H. Gardner that *Senate approve to amend the procedure for nomination of Professor Emeritus from:*

*“Nominations will be received by the Committee during the final year of the faculty member’s appointment to the university, or for three years after the date of their retirement.”*

*to:*

*“Nominations will **normally** be received by the Committee during the final year of the faculty member’s appointment to the university, or for three years after the date of their retirement.”*

President Ivany, Chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee, spoke to the motion noting that the current criteria for the designation of Professor Emeritus include a time restriction for the receipt of nominations. The amendment proposed by the Honorary Degrees Committee is intended to bring greater awareness in the scholarly community and provide the scope for broader consideration of those who may be eligible for the designation.

A. Quema stated that while adding the word “normally” addresses the issue concerning those faculty members who were not considered in the past, she expressed concern about future potential omissions.

President Ivany noted that a sub-committee of the Honorary Degrees Committee is undertaking a broader revision of all the procedures pertaining to the awarding of honorary degrees and Professor Emeriti designations and that their recommendations will be brought to Senate.

MOTION CARRIED.

ii. Nomination for  
Professor Emeritus

On behalf of the Honorary Degrees Committee, President Ivany introduced the recommendation for Professor Emeritus. A vote by secret ballot resulted in majority support for the approval of Professor Emeritus status for the candidate.

c) Nominating Committee

J. Hennessy, Chair of the Nominating Committee, reported that the call for nominations was announced at Senate and followed up with both an email message and a reminder.

It was moved by J. Hennessy and seconded by R. *Cunningham* that Senate accept the slate of nominations.

The Chair called for further nominations from the floor. No additional nominations were forthcoming.

MOTION CARRIED.

In response to a concern raised by H. Kitchin about the potential difficulty when a Senator with two years remaining in his/her term is selected to serve in a position with a 3-year term, P. Corkum explained that a replacement would be sought for the duration of the term as is the case when Senators are on sabbatical leave. J. Hennessy noted that all Senators being nominated for the 3-year positions are new Senators with three year terms.

d) Academic Planning and  
Priorities Committee

P. Corkum stated that the proposed Standing Committee concerning Academic Planning and Priorities was not addressed at the April meeting of Senate and in the meantime, Senate has received for consideration a proposal for an *ad hoc* Academic Planning and Priorities Committee.

T. Herman provided the background for the motion concerning the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee stating that the proposal was in response to a request to Senate from the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee for the creation of a committee to examine ways that the integrity of academic programs is maintained during times of financial constraint and the impact of reduced capacity on present and future programs is minimized. He also noted that the Senate Executive discussed the proposal and struck a sub-committee to create the motion. The intent of the motion is to create a mechanism by which the institution can examine its current position, its goals and the way forward and to bring recommendations forward to Senate for approval as Senate has the purview over academic programs. As noted in the

preamble to the motion, the committee was designed to provide transparency of discussion and considerable interaction between Senate Committees, Senate and the Board of Governors. He noted that the proposed committee presents a mechanism for decision-making to allow the institution to move forward and to ensure that the integrity and diversity of high quality programs are maintained.

The Chair read a communication from the Chair of the Faculty of Arts Council expressing the Council's concerns with the structure and composition of the proposed Academic Planning and Priorities Standing Committee and opposing its creation.

It was moved by T. Herman and seconded by H. Kitchin *that item 3)e) Alternative Version of the Planning and Priorities Committee become the next item of business.*

MOTION CARRIED.

e) Alternative Version of the Planning and Priorities Committee

P. Williams introduced the proposed committee by stating that the individual Faculty Councils had discussed the motion as presented on the agenda for the April meeting of Senate, and although there was agreement with the concept, there was concern about the details. The alternative motion was discussed at the Faculty Council meeting on May 10<sup>th</sup> and is being put forward for discussion at Senate.

It was moved by P. Williams and seconded by H. Kitchin *that the Ad Hoc Academic Planning and Priorities Committee be approved.*

1. *This ad hoc committee shall serve at the pleasure of Senate, for a period not to exceed one year. The committee's composition, mandate, and procedures shall be reviewed by Senate no later than the May 2012 Senate meeting, at which point the committee might be disbanded completely, continued in the same or modified form, or replaced with a standing committee.*
2. *This committee's goal shall be to gather and synthesize information relevant to identifying the ongoing academic goals and priorities of the University. In pursuit of this goal, the committee shall consult widely with all relevant sectors, foster discussions at all levels of the academic sector, and maintain channels of communication with the three Faculty Councils. For example, the committee might encourage units, faculties, and interdisciplinary Programs to engage in self-studies to identify their short-term and long-term plans and priorities; it might facilitate discussion and sharing of information across units, faculties, and Programs; it might conduct broad-scale surveys, town hall meetings, etc., to gather information and opinions from across campus. It shall endeavour to provide relevant data to all those who need it to inform these discussions (e.g., financial information; enrolment information; information from other institutions; information from other committees, etc.).*
3. *Through its chairs, the committee shall report regularly to Senate on its procedures and its progress throughout the year. Its goal shall be to begin to forge some consensus across the academic sector regarding where we are now, where we want to be in the future (e.g., five years from now), and how we can best get to where we want to be, given relevant constraints and opportunities.*

*Membership:*

*The Vice President Academic and one Senator, who shall serve as non-voting co-Chairs  
Dean of Arts*

*Dean of Professional Studies*

*Dean of Pure and Applied Sciences*

*Dean of Research and Graduate Studies*

*Six faculty members, two each from Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied  
Science*

*One Librarian*

*The Student Vice-President Academic*

*Procedures for Appointment:*

*Senator, elected by Senate from amongst the 27 Senators representing the Faculties of Arts,  
Professional Studies and Pure and Applied Science.*

*Faculty members, elected by their respective faculties*

*Librarian, elected by Librarians*

D. Seamone noted that the interdisciplinary Programs transcend the Faculties and have a different point of view that should be represented on the Committee.

It was moved by D. Seamone and seconded by G. Whitehall *that the motion be amended to include in the committee a representative of interdisciplinary Programs to be elected by a Steering Committee of the interdisciplinary Programs.*

L. Lusby questioned the process for the selection of the representative from the interdisciplinary Programs. A. Quema expressed concern about the size of the Committee if another faculty member is added. D. Holmberg noted that the committee is an *ad hoc* committee and that the membership could be revisited if it becomes a permanent standing committee. As the purpose of the committee is to provide a mechanism for discussion, greater representation is desirable.

P. Williams noted that a concern had been raised at the Faculty Council meeting about the additional work that would be involved in the self-studies. He explained that the language has not been changed as the self-studies are optional and not a requirement.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

L. Lusby spoke of the benefit of having consistent language throughout the university that incorporates interdisciplinary programs and accommodates that structure.

A. Quema noted that interdisciplinary studies have implications beyond academics in that resources may be diverted away from the departments. Senate must represent what is going on in the broader faculties and not be perceived as making decisions about resources. She also questioned the link between the proposed committee and the university's financial position, institutional relationships with the province, and the upcoming MOU.

President Ivany stated that the genesis of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee came from the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee as the Committee felt that a piece was missing in the deliberative

process. The link between the proposed committee is a collegial manifestation of Senate deliberating and protecting the academic integrity of the university.

G. Whitehall noted that the proposed committee is an important one and that the academic sector should always be engaged in conversations about the institution's identity and distribution of resources but expressed concern about the timing of the formation of the committee. He spoke of the cultural assumption of a presumed envelope of reduction in the midst of economic concerns, presumptions about tailoring programs, and uncertainty about faculty staffing levels.

D. Reid spoke of the importance of a Senate committee to openly and thoughtfully discuss the university and its programs, especially in a time of change. He noted the absence, except for the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, of graduate programs representation in the committee membership. He spoke of the declining population of younger students and the low enrolment in some Masters programs on campus.

It was moved by D. Reid and seconded by L. Aylward *that the motion be amended to include in the committee membership a faculty member involved in a high enrolment graduate program.*

L. Aylward noted that the work of a committee often depends upon the committee composition and suggested that it is incumbent upon all faculty to become involved. A. Quema spoke of the importance of committee members consulting and inviting input. L. Lusby noted that it is the responsibility of all to talk to committee membership. She also commented that the committee could either focus on supporting and sustaining the current programs or look to the future and consider alternatives.

S. MacDougall noted that the proposed membership on the committee includes sufficient representation of graduate programs. D. MacKinnon noted that there are a large number of graduate students in the Education programs.

The motion was withdrawn.

J. Banks noted that the Director of Open Acadia is involved with all Faculties and has an overview of all programs and knowledge of their interaction. This position has traditionally been filled by a member from the academic sector.

It was moved by J. Banks and seconded by R. Cunningham *that the motion be amended to state that the Director of Open Acadia and the Vice President Academic serve as non-voting co-Chairs.*

D. Holmberg suggested that it might be best not to restrict the co-Chair to an *ex-officio* position. R. Cunningham noted that as distance education is one of the future directions in post-secondary education, the input of the Director of Open Acadia should be included. By designating the Director as a co-Chair, the committee size would remain the same. A. Quema stated that the Director should be an open participant and not limited to a role of co-Chair.

J. Banks rephrased the amendment to *the Director of Open Acadia be a member of the Committee.* R. Cunningham agreed to the change in the motion.

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

D. Holmberg stated that Senate, as representing the academic sector, must own the process, and determine the structure, role, and purpose of the committee.

H. Kitchin expressed concern that the processes for the committee and the role of Senate are unclear. P. Williams spoke of the intent of the proposed *ad hoc* committee to facilitate people working together to articulate answers to these questions, i.e. how will the committee work, who will be consulted, what are the relationships to other bodies and to then report to Senate. He also noted that a similar Standing Committee is common among university Senates.

It was moved by D. Silver and seconded by S. Markham-Starr *that the motion be amended to “Through its chairs, the committee shall report regularly to Senate on its procedures and its progress throughout the year, with the initial report on the procedures and mapping of how the committee will function to come to Senate no later than October 2011.”*

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

President Ivany spoke of the primacy of preserving and protecting the integrity of the institution and of the need for deliberative processes and creative solutions. He also noted that such a committee is normative at other universities.

P. Doerr expressed concern that the committee may disadvantage small units and programs.

I. Hutchinson noted that the value in such a committee to present logics other than those driven by economics.

D. Seamone expressed concern that the sense of urgency and duress is not conducive to thoughtful consideration and that the committee should be permitted a longer timeline to determine the most appropriate processes.

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED.

*Therefore, be it resolved that the following ad hoc committee shall be formed:*

***Ad Hoc Academic Planning and Priorities Committee***

- 1. This ad hoc committee shall serve at the pleasure of Senate, for a period not to exceed one year. The committee’s composition, mandate, and procedures shall be reviewed by Senate no later than the May 2012 Senate meeting, at which point the committee might be disbanded completely, continued in the same or modified form, or replaced with a standing committee.*
- 2. This committee’s goal shall be to gather and synthesize information relevant to identifying the ongoing academic goals and priorities of the University. In pursuit of this goal, the committee shall consult widely with all relevant sectors, foster discussions at all levels of the academic sector, and maintain channels of communication with Faculty Councils. For example, the committee might encourage units, faculties and interdisciplinary Programs to engage in self-studies to identify their short-term and long-term plans and priorities; it might facilitate discussion and sharing of information across units, faculties and Programs; it might conduct broad-scale surveys, town hall meetings, etc., to gather information and opinions from across campus. It shall endeavour to provide relevant data to*

*all those who need it to inform these discussions (e.g., financial information; enrolment information; information from other institutions; information from other committees, etc.).*

3. *Through its chairs, the committee shall report regularly to Senate on its procedures and its progress throughout the year, with the initial report on the procedures and mapping of how the committee will function to come to Senate no later than October 2011. Its goal shall be to begin to forge some consensus across the academic sector regarding where we are now, where we want to be in the future (e.g., five years from now), and how we can best get to where we want to be, given relevant constraints and opportunities.*

*Membership:*

*The Vice President Academic and one Senator, who shall serve as non-voting co-Chairs*

*Dean of Arts*

*Dean of Professional Studies*

*Dean of Pure and Applied Sciences*

*Dean of Research and Graduate Studies*

*Director of Open Acadia*

*Six faculty members, two each from Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science*

*Representative of interdisciplinary Programs to be elected by the Steering Committees of the interdisciplinary Programs*

*One Librarian*

*The Student Vice-President Academic*

*Procedures for Appointment:*

*Senator, elected by Senate from amongst the 27 Senators representing the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies and Pure and Applied Science*

*Faculty members, elected by their respective faculties*

*Librarian, elected by Librarians*

*Representative from the interdisciplinary Programs, elected by the Steering Committees of the interdisciplinary Programs*

- d) Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

T. Herman withdrew the motion.

- f) Senate Committee Annual Reports

P. Corkum stated that the committee reports would be on the agenda for the June meeting of Senate and that their review presents an opportunity for Senate to provide feedback and items to the committees for their consideration.

- 5) Adjournment

On motion of P. Doerr and seconded by G. Whitehall, the meeting adjourned at 11:20 am.

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

---

K. Slater Padovani, Recording Secretary



**APPENDIX A**

Available upon request.