

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday, 14 November 2011 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Deputy Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 36 present.

- 1) Approval of Agenda It was moved by D. Kruisselbrink and seconded by J. Wentzell *that the agenda be approved.*

MOTION CARRIED.

- 2) Minutes of the Meeting of It was moved by B. Anderson and seconded by D. MacKinnon *that the minutes of Tuesday, 11 October 2011 be approved as distributed.*
11 October 2011

MOTION CARRIED.

Note from the Deputy Chair: B. Fawcett was minuted as a seconder to approve the minutes of 12 September 2011, however, he is not a member of Senate and only attends when W. Brackney or H. Gardner are not available.

- 3) Announcements
a) From the Deputy Chair
of Senate

Regrets were received from L. Aylward, W. Brackney, N. Clark, R. Cunningham, B. Jessome, R. Jotcham, H. Kitchin, G. Phillips, G. Poulter, K. Power, and C. Stanley.

The Deputy Chair read a message from D. Seamone, notifying Senate that she will be stepping down as Chair of Senate as of 31 December 2011 since she will be on medical leave to undergo back surgery in the second semester of this academic year. She requested that the election for a new Chair proceed in a timely manner after the November 2011 meeting of Senate. The Deputy Chair pointed out that the position of Chair of Senate is open to all faculty members, not just sitting Senators. D. Seamone also sent regrets for today's meeting as she was attending the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion in San Francisco.

- b) From the President and
Vice-Chancellor

President Ivany reported that the MOU process continues to move along slowly, although increasing in intensity in recent weeks. Another meeting of the CONSUP MOU Negotiating Team and Government took place on October 19. Government expects the new MOU to be in place by the end of the calendar year. By the time of the December 14 Senate meeting it should be clear whether or not this deadline will be met.

President Ivany attended the AUCC Centennial Membership Meetings which took place in Montreal October 25 - 27. It was evident that Acadia represents a rare space in higher education in Canada. For example, universities such as Acadia and Mount Allison have recently been characterized as "boutique universities" in the Globe & Mail Canadian University Report. Our message needs to effectively communicate our fundamental differences.

A. Quéma expressed concern that small universities may be regarded as not financially viable. How do we convince government that the economic formula has to be changed? President Ivany agreed that the current growth-based funding models are not particularly effective in supporting universities like Acadia. He noted that over the past 20 years, several universities that were once similar to Acadia have been incented to grow through government funding models and now bear little resemblance to our university. This is the primary reason Acadia has been advocating for a different funding formula in Nova Scotia which would allow Acadia to build on its historic strengths.

G. Whitehall stated that using the term “primarily undergraduate” does not sufficiently emphasize Acadia’s commitment to research and graduate studies. President Ivany agreed that both “primarily undergraduate” and “small university” do not do justice to Acadia’s culture. He added that we need to highlight Acadia’s unique academic culture and to find the language to adequately define that space.

D. MacKinnon reported that we are now part of a newly established consortium of small universities: the Alliance of Canadian Comprehensive Research Universities (ACCRU).

c) From the Vice President Academic

T. Herman attended the Academica Summit on “Strategic Enrolment Management, Marketing & Leadership Strategies” on November 9. President Ivany represented Acadia on two panels: “Letting Go: The Challenge of Driving Campus Innovation in the Current Context” and “Being Bold: The Potential of Institutional Differentiation”, and made a strong case, particularly in the latter, for the importance of differentiation.

T. Herman reported on recently received awards:

- An Acadia computer programming team took first place out of 17 teams at the Atlantic Provinces Interdisciplinary Council on the Sciences (APICS) conference, and it was the top Canadian team at the Northeastern North American competition.
- Two Acadia honours students received the awards for Top Poster and Top Paper at the Atlantic Universities Geoscience Conference (AUGC).
- Recent Engineering graduate Matt Dugie was this year's winner of both the Engineers Nova Scotia Award and the Engineers Nova Scotia Prize, a prize that is awarded to one student each year who best demonstrates the promise of using outstanding abilities to serve society in an ethical manner as a professional engineer.

d) Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

P. Doerr, Co-Chair of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, reported that the Committee, which was formed in the spring, has two goals: to gather and synthesize information relevant to identifying the ongoing academic goals and priorities of the University, and to begin to forge some consensus across the academic sector regarding where we are now, where we want to be in the future, and how we can best get to where we want to be, given relevant constraints and opportunities. The Committee consists of sixteen people:

- The Vice President Academic and one Senator (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

The Committee met five times since September, and had vigorous debates around topics such as relevance of the university strategic plan, mandate and procedures of the Committee, long-term commitments to programs, and responsibility for coping with short-term issues. Also, in keeping with Senate's instruction to consult widely with all relevant sectors, foster discussions at all levels of the academic sector, and maintain channels of communication with Faculty Councils, the Committee has begun gathering information from other universities and Acadia as well. The Committee started putting together a template for a state of unit questionnaire, which will be sent to departments in due course. Committee updates will also occur at the next meetings of the Faculty Councils, and the Committee will attempt to call a meeting of the University Faculty Council, ideally before the end of the calendar year. Early next year there will be a Town Hall meeting, as well as a wider online questionnaire.

A. Quéma requested additional information on the vigorous debates. P. Doerr provided examples: various debates on the university strategic plan, the Committee mandate, how best to proceed on various items, the best way to draw up a questionnaire for departments, and the timing thereof, and what sorts of consultations should be carried out.

4) Brought Forward from
11 October 2011

a) Senate Committee Annual
Reports

It was moved by A. Quéma and seconded by D. MacKinnon *that Senate receive the annual reports of its standing committees for the academic year 2010-2011 as received at this meeting.*

i. Curriculum Committee

(APPENDIX A) A. Quéma pointed out that she had been away part of the year and had not yet seen the report. She reported that items discussed were the introduction of a new form for new program proposals that require consideration by MPHEC, and a proposed Music/Education double degree program. There was dissent among Committee members regarding the latter, and the Committee therefore moved to bring this forward to Senate.

J. Hennessy pointed out that it was unusual to comment in the report that not all Committee members agreed. A. Quéma agreed. J. Hennessy also reported that he initially regarded the new MPHEC forms to be a lot more work to complete, but is now in favour of them.

G. Whitehall reported that the Political Science Program recently wanted to change its name to "Department of Politics", but that there was no clear process for changing the name of a program. A. Quéma pointed out that often a name change is submitted along with other changes to the program, in which case the changes are to be submitted to the Curriculum Committee. She agreed to find a process of some sort in the case of a name change only. P. Williams suggested consulting R. Raeside, who changed "Geology" to "Earth and Environmental Science". The Deputy Chair pointed out that program changes that affect the degree granted require consideration by MPHEC. G. Whitehall suggested that the name change does affect the degree granted, in that

students would receive a Bachelor of Arts in Politics, not Political Science. However, as the degree granted is a Bachelor of Arts either way, the change may not require MPHEC approval. Some name changes appear to have occurred without any formal procedure. T. Herman offered to coordinate a discussion on this issue with the Registrar and Departments.

MOTION CARRIED.

- b) Motion from Dr. Daniel Silver, Director of the School of Computer Science

T. Herman reported that D. Silver could not be present and had asked him to move the motion on his behalf. The intent of the motion was to clarify the relationship between Adjunct Professor positions and Emeritus positions. T. Herman proposed to withdraw the motion, however, as there needs to be a discussion first between the Office of Research & Graduate Studies, the Honorary Degrees Committee and the Vice-President Academic. The issue will then be brought back to Senate with recommendations for revising wording where there is confusion.

5) New Business

- a) Notice of Motion from Dr. John Eustace, Associate Professor, English and Theatre

(APPENDIX B) J. Eustace presented his notice of motion to Senate. The motion will be discussed in full at the December meeting of Senate. J. Eustace expressed his hope that more Senators will be in attendance given the importance of the issue.

- b) Motion from Dr. Anne Quéma, Associate Professor, English and Theatre

It was moved by A. Quéma and seconded by G. Whitehall *that, as was past practice, the minutes of Senate meetings be taken so as to convey the gist of Senators' arguments with regard to matters under discussion. This motion is based on the notion that a) minutes represent a crucial archive of decisions Senators have made over the years, and that b) minutes operate as a means of documenting a democratic process of argumentation and decision-making that should be available to all faculty members.*

The Deputy Chair pointed out, at the request of the Chair, that according to Robert's Rules of Order, it is sufficient to record only actions that are taken by the group. That is not to say that you cannot have more detail if desired.

A. Quéma explained that, although aware of what Robert's Rules of Order state, this is not a reason to do so. She also noted that the motion should not be taken as any reflection on the person taking the minutes.

P. Doerr asked how A. Quéma would propose to enforce this.

A. Quéma responded that she had not thought in those terms. She was looking at past practices, and remembering a time that Senators argued that minutes be taken thoroughly so that different positions would be recorded. She acknowledged that it is a challenge to record the proceedings truthfully, but she pointed out that we have the option to approve, disapprove or correct minutes. She added that Senate meetings are not just for Senators, but for the whole university.

G. Whitehall expressed his support of the motion. He referred to former Chair of Senate Dr. Ian Wilks, who said that the main power of Senate is to have the debates of Acadia recorded, as a mechanism to identify tensions in the development of the academic sector, so that in the future we could return to the debates that shaped our present.

S. Sweet reported that meetings of the SRC are recorded in full and broadcast on Axe Radio. She noted that for written minutes a complete record was too much, and asked Senators where they would see a compromise between recording what everyone says versus getting the actual feeling of the argument.

A. Quéma responded that in past minutes, the gist of the argument was captured. She acknowledged that this is a difficult task, but that it had been done in the past.

P. Williams asked what happens to the audio recordings of Senate meetings. J. Postema responded that they are used as a back-up to the written notes to fill in any gaps, and that the recordings are deleted after a few months.

J. Best pointed out that Senate Bylaws state that Senate procedures are governed by Beauchesne's Rules and Forms in the House of Commons in Canada, and that a shift to Robert's Rules of Order had not been discussed. No one present at the meeting was familiar with Beauchesne's Rules.

C. Deal noted that there had been a Senate Workshop on Robert's Rules scheduled in early October. The Deputy Chair noted that the workshop was cancelled due to insufficient interest.

G. Whitehall wondered whether, due to the need to save resources, too much was put on certain individuals' plates, and whether that had led to less detailed recordings of minutes. He recalled a discussion about separating the duties of the Secretary to the Board and the Secretary of Senate in order to maintain a distance between the two bodies.

The Deputy Chair asked for input from the Recording Secretary. J. Postema responded that the way minutes are taken should not depend on an individual's workload, but should be according to whatever is in the best interest of Senate and the university. From past experience she expressed a preference for something in between the extremes of recording actions and motions only and recording the meeting almost verbatim, i.e., recording the exact wording of actions and motions, and providing some background as well.

J. Whidden spoke in favour of the motion and stressed the historical importance of having the tenor of the debate recorded. He pointed out that the Town of Wolfville has full recordings of all sessions available on its website. He recommended that this is what should happen with the audio recordings of Senate meetings, not as an alternative, but in addition to the written record. The Deputy Chair pointed out that this was not covered under the current motion and would require a separate motion.

W. Slights pointed out that the first sentence of the motion is really the motion, with the remainder being the rationale for the motion, which generally is not voted on. The Deputy Chair agreed.

H. Gardner asked for clarification whether it was the intent of the motion to have arguments summarized, or to have names and what was said included. A. Quéma responded that the latter was the intent: to have, as was past practice, a sequential approach, following the flow of the debate, identifying the speakers, and capturing the gist of the discussion.

P. Doerr pointed out that some may not want their names and points recorded in the minutes. A. Quéma responded that Senate is a political body, and that

when she speaks, she does so on her own behalf, and stands by what she said.

The Deputy Chair clarified that if the motion was passed, Senate minutes would return to past practice, identifying speakers by name, followed by the main gist of each speaker's statement. If the motion was defeated, the current practice would be followed, in which the main points of discussions would be summarized, but without names being attached to particular points.

MOTION CARRIED.

6) Adjournment

On motion of J. Hennessy and seconded by I. Hutchinson, the meeting adjourned at 5:21 pm.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

J. Postema, Recording Secretary

APPENDIX A

Annual Report of the Senate Curriculum Committee (2010-11)

Members

Colin Bell (FPAS, chair)

Ian Feltmate (FPS)

Rosemary Jotcham (Registrar)

Christina Muehlberger (ASU)

Kyle Power (ASU)

Anne Quéma (FA)

Rob Raeside (FPAS)

May Abou Zahra (FA)

The Senate Curriculum Committee met on five occasions (19 October, 7 December, 6 January, 21 January, and 21 March). During these sessions, the committee analyzed curriculum submissions from the three faculties, some of which required multiple meetings including representations from the departments or schools concerned.

A new form was introduced for new program proposals, for programs that will require consideration by MPHEC. This form is arranged similarly to the MPHEC forms, thereby ensuring that the submissions are in line with the requirements from MPHEC.

New course proposals, course modification proposals, and course deletions were discussed, and in some cases clarification sought, before they were forwarded with the committee's recommendations to Senate for consideration. Particular emphasis was placed on submissions from the Schools of Music and Education, for a proposed Music Education five-year double-degree program and on significant changes in the B.Ed. program. The Music/Education double degree program depended on the outcome of Senate's decision on the B.Ed. changes, not all of which the committee endorsed before forwarding to Senate.

New majors were identified for the BBA programs and recommended to Senate.

Changes were also recommended in the nomenclature of co-op offerings.

Rob Raeside,
Secretary

APPENDIX B

Notice of Motion from Dr. John Eustace, Associate Professor, English and Theatre

RE: Advocacy for the revitalization of the academic sector

That the President and Vice President Academic advocate to the Board of Governors for the revitalization of the academic sector and take appropriate measures to guard against the academic sector's deprioritization and diminution in the overall Acadia budget.