



A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 10th December 2012 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 46 present.

1) Approval of Agenda

Before the motion to approve the agenda was moved, the Chair detailed three possible changes to the agenda.

Item 5) c) ii, the “APRC Report on Computer Science” was withdrawn from the agenda because it was not yet ready, and would be added to the January 2013 agenda.

Item 5) c) i, the “APRC Prioritized Recommendations for the F.C. Manning School of Business”. The Chair noted that the requirement for the Notice of Motion had not been fully met because relevant materials were not circulated until a few days before the Senate meeting. The Chair explained that waiving of the Notice of Motion would require an absolute majority of all Senators.

As there were no objections, this item remained on the agenda.

The Chair requested one addition to the agenda, “Conflict between Constitutions”, be added under “New Business, Item 5) a)”, which would result in the other items being renumbered accordingly. This would also allow the discussion to take place at a time when P. Doerr had the Chair.

As there were no objections, this item was added to the agenda.

Motion to approve the agenda as revised. Moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by J. Hennessy.

The Chair asked for any further amendments, additions or changes to the agenda. There were none.

MOTION CARRIED.

2) Minutes of the Meeting of
19 November 2012

Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 19th November as distributed. Moved by S. Major, seconded by D. Benoit.

The Chair asked for any errors, omissions or changes to the Minutes.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES CARRIED.

3) Announcements
a) From the Chair of Senate

Regrets were received from W. Brackney, H. Gardner, B. Latta, H. Kitchin, and A. Rice.

The Chair thanked R. Hare for taking the minutes again and noted that J. Postema continued to be the Recording Secretary for all other than minute taking, and would handle all agenda items and requests for information. The Chair noted that in a recent meeting with President Ivany, Senate minute taking had been discussed with a promise of a long term solution to be determined.

The Chair now provided updates on meetings that she had attended or planned to attend in her role as Chair of Senate. These were as follows:

- The Budget Advisory Committee: The Chair was unable to attend this meeting as it was scheduled at a time when she was teaching. It was noted that if any Senator had questions, D. Youden and R. Hare were members of the committee.
- Meeting with Paul Jewer and President Ivany: The Chair reminded Senate of the changes to the Senate Constitution that were approved in November regarding membership. These changes were discussed with P. Jewer and he was asked whether he felt that the changes 'alter the composition' of Senate (in which case approval by 2/3rds of the Board would be required). P. Jewer did not believe that to be the case, but agreed to check further with the Chair of the Governance Committee before making a final ruling.

The Chair noted that the main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the pan-Acadia planning committee proposal that was first raised over the summer. The Chair reported that she had shared the concerns of the APC with P. Jewer and President Ivany, and had passed on her own concerns summarized in her report in the November Senate meeting, regarding the need to find a balance between efficiency, versus accountability / transparency.

The Chair put these concerns to P. Jewer and President Ivany, and all were in agreement that it would be a mistake to create additional bureaucracy, but that it was important to have transparency and some sort of mechanism in place for regular contact between Senate and the Board. P. Jewer stated that although the Board does receive feedback from the academic sector, it is mainly from the Senior Admin team and from the Faculty reps to the Board; and P. Jewer felt that it would be desirable to hear from a wider group of individuals.

The Chair noted that they felt that it was both too early and too late to decide how potential collaboration between the ARC and the APC might work. This was because on the one hand, the APC has only just started to meet and does not yet have concrete recommendations to bring forward, so that it would be hard at this stage for the ARC to provide a supporting role. On the other hand, the budgeting process for 2013-14 is already well underway, so that in that sense it could now be too late to provide a lot of input into the budgeting process.

The Chair noted that the Academic Resources Committee is an ad hoc committee of the Board and was not reinstated at the October Board

meeting, as the Board was waiting for the outcome of this discussion. It was agreed that the ARC could be re-formed as an ad hoc committee in February at the meeting of the Board, with similar membership to the present committee. However, D. Youden could be added as an ex officio non-voting member, to bring additional financial information and expertise to the table. In addition, at least one of the Board members of the committee would be chosen for financial expertise, and at least one of the Board members of the committee would be chosen from the Board representatives to Senate, to further facilitate communication between Senate and the Board on academic planning issues.

The Chair stated that a joint meeting of the APC and the ARC could take place in March 2013, with a suggestion that P. Jewer and President Ivany also be present to request feedback from both committees and to discuss ways in which they might collaborate together.

Following this meeting the Chair would bring proposals back to Senate for further discussion, as would P. Jewer to the Board of Governors.

Senators were asked if they had any questions or comments.

There were no immediate comments and a good show of hands indicated general approval.

A. Quema asked about the composition of the ARC.

The Chair stated that in addition to the four Board members, the current membership includes the Chair of Senate, the VP Academic and the ASU VP Academic, in addition to the Senior Faculty Representative on the Board and four Board members.

A. Quema asked whether that could be broadened and the Chair reported that she had been asked whether there were other members of Senate that she would like to add to the ARC, but that no specific position had come to mind. The Chair noted that because the committee was ad hoc in nature, it would be relatively easy to add additional members if the need should become apparent.

b) From the President

President Ivany noted that the MOU process is continuing and that one of the major pieces that concerns Acadia was the funding formula, which in the past was almost entirely enrolment driven. President Ivany noted that the discussions have moved away from a formula that was purely enrolment driven, to a discussion of a formula that is weighted more towards fixed costs.

President Ivany noted that the decision had been made to delay implementation of a new funding formula for one year.

President Ivany reminded Senate of the \$25,000,000 Excellence and Innovation Fund put in place by the government recently, to fund initiatives that would take structural costs and expenses out of the system. He noted that in the first round of submissions Acadia received small amounts of \$25,000 (used on a maintenance project) and \$100,000 that was used for a feasibility study of a Compressed Natural Gas conversion from Bunker C fuel.

President Ivany noted that the second round of proposals had now been submitted to the government and that Acadia had submitted a full proposal for a conversion to CNG, which would have significant environmental benefits and also significantly reduce operating expenditures. President Ivany noted that this would be the single largest cost saving measure that Acadia could take. President Ivany noted that the government may forward their decision by March 2013, and that if all went well, the conversion could be in place by the fall term.

President Ivany spoke to a second item – that of his monitoring of the national university scene – and noted that there are fewer and fewer universities like Acadia. This reality has disadvantaged small universities like Acadia when it comes to government funding formulas and the granting council agencies. President Ivany commented that he has particularly monitored strategic mandate agreements in Ontario and noted that the universities there continue to move further away from the Acadia model. President Ivany stated therefore that the onus will be on Acadia and sister institutions to stress the differences that exist between institutions. President Ivany noted that the exploration and declaration of the academic elements will prove important, and highlighted the importance of working with institutions such as Mount Allison, Bishop's and Saint F.X., that are more aligned with Acadia's model.

c) From the Vice-President
Academic

T. Herman pointed out that President Ivany was quite correct in his assertion that the strategic mandate agreements make those universities in Ontario appear very different from Acadia. T. Herman also noted, though, that the large universities also seek to establish an experience for their first year students, and that they may even suggest that their students' first year experience will be 'small and intimate', despite the many thousands of students attending the institution.

M. Rios and K. Power joined the meeting late.

J. Hennessy asked a question of President Ivany, and stated that he felt it was a substantial achievement to get agreement on a change in the funding formula. J. Hennessy asked whether there was any opportunity to achieve some redress and have funding returned in recognition of the many years in which the existing funding formula penalized Acadia.

President Ivany responded that Acadia was attempting to get some redress but that this was proving difficult because a certain amount of retrenchment by the other institutions had occurred. President Ivany also noted, however, that the ground had shifted somewhat and it was recognized that the previous funding formula may not have been the best means of determining funding to institutions. President Ivany felt that Acadia was gaining ground steadily, but that there remained a need to temper expectations that logic would carry the day, because every player at the table was intent on defending their ground and the funding that they currently receive.

M. Rios asked about the Access Copyright Agreement that the university had discussed at Senate in June, and that the University agreed to sign as a stop gap measure. Matthew asked how the new agreement is working out, and what steps are being taken to move away from the agreement in future.

S. Lochhead responded that the Council of Atlantic University Libraries is working to have procedures in place before the end of the agreement. S. Lochhead also noted that the AUCC has produced a statement and come out

with some guidelines, so that action on this item is definitely underway.

J. Whidden asked about the proposal for ‘teaching only’ universities that has been discussed in Ontario and asked how this might impact Acadia.

President Ivany responded that the temperature has been lowered on the creation of new universities in Ontario because the existing universities are saying that they can manage the same thing if they are given increased resources and can increase capacity. President Ivany acknowledged, however, that the idea of a ‘teaching only’ institution has not gone away yet. President Ivany saw that as quite problematic, in that universities would market themselves in that way, and that would add to the general clutter that currently serves to confuse new students. Institutions may market themselves to students as one thing, but under closer inspection are in fact something completely different. President Ivany felt that this was very much driven by the research intensive universities pushing for new funding in order to pursue their research missions, and the feeling that if the government didn’t have new dollars then it could be diverted away from ‘teaching only’ institutions.

President Ivany felt that there was a need to clarify the space that Acadia occupies so that others could understand how different Acadia was from the model of the “teaching only” university. In the USA, in contrast, the space that Acadia occupies in the university landscape is very well-known and understood.

4) Brought forward from 19 November, 2012

- a) Motions from the Senate Chair regarding possible changes to Senate Procedures (*attached – motion #4 and #5 to be considered*)

As the Chair wished to bring forward motions, she passed the Chair over to P. Doerr.

Motion that individuals or committees making recommendations to Senate will consult with the Deputy Chair or the Chair first, to make sure the wording is clear. Moved by D. Holmberg, seconded by D. Benoit. (discussion was postponed definitely in the November meeting, and continues where it left off)

D. Benoit stated that the note below the motion did not line up with the wording of the motion itself, and that he was opposed to the note and what would be required in the note, whereas he remained in support of the motion.

P. Doerr noted that Senate would be voting on the motion itself.

D. Holmberg noted that Senate was being asked to vote on the motion itself. If it was felt that the motion could be made clearer, then an amendment would be in order.

A. Quema saw the point of the motion to avoid lengthy debates on the floor of Senate, and to avoid the process of lengthy amendments. A. Quema felt that if a motion was not properly worded a simple solution would be to turn the motion back to the mover if the wording was proving problematical. A. Quema felt that otherwise people would feel that the Deputy Chair and Chair were looking over their shoulder, and that they would therefore feel uncomfortable. A. Quema was not in favour of the motion.

J. Hennessy stated that he would vote in favour because he had seen examples of motions coming to Senate when individuals didn't really know what they wanted, so that a lot of time was taken up in Senate, whereas a discussion prior to Senate with the Chair or Deputy Chair could have provided clarity and saved time.

V. Zamlynn noted that a motion to provide clarity was good but could also have the effect of limiting freedom of individual Senators to make motions to Senate. V. Zamlynn was in favour of the motion, but felt that the wording could be revised to allow Senators to seek advice from the Chair or Deputy Chair only if they wished to.

J. Banks agreed with A. Quema that the essence of the motion was to avoid crafting the wording of motions on the floor of Senate. Having said that, J. Banks felt that a culture could be built at Senate that encouraged Senators to seek advice from the Chair or Deputy Chair on the wording of their motions, without this being an absolute requirement.

D. Benoit wondered whether this motion would prevent motions coming from the floor of Senate.

D. Holmberg responded that because of the existing seven day 'notice of motion' it was not normally possible to make a main motion on the floor of Senate anyway. With the approval of a majority of all Senators, however, the 'notice of motion' could be waived. D. Holmberg noted that there was no problem moving secondary motions (e.g., amendments) on the floor of Senate.

D. Benoit believed that this motion would not allow for requests to waive the required 'notice of motion'. D. Benoit took 'will' to mean 'is required to' in the motion.

A. Quema noted that the motion was one approach to the crafting of motions and that this motion could be postponed and returned to only if it proved necessary.

C. Stanley stated that he would be voting against the motion. He felt that the wording of the note detailed below the motion suggested an antagonistic relationship between the mover of any motion and the Chair or Deputy Chair of Senate. C. Stanley felt that this was not the intent of the motion.

J. Hennessy noted that on the subject of a 'main motion without notice to Senate', it would be advisable for the mover to bring a plan to request waiver of notice of motion to the attention of the Chair of Senate anyway, since it would be the Chair who would formally be asking Senate to waive the seven day 'notice of motion' in such a situation.

MOTION FAILED.

Motion that during debate, the Chair, as much as possible, alternates speaking turns between those in favour of a motion and those opposed to a motion. Moved by D. Holmberg, seconded by D. Benoit.

D. Holmberg spoke to the motion and explained that a careful reading of the Robert's Rules had brought this approach to her attention, and that this had come up during the orientation session for new Senators, who felt it would be a good process to follow. D. Holmberg noted that the Senate Executive did

not feel this approach to be necessary.

J. MacLeod asked when the person without an opinion would get to speak.

D. Holmberg observed that a person with no opinion would probably want to wait until they had heard both sides of the argument, but that a process could be put into place to allow for input from those without a strong opinion to one side or the other.

W. Slights noted that he had heard people speak both for and against a motion in order to get different points across.

D. Holmberg noted that it would be perfectly acceptable for a Senator to speak one turn in favour of a motion, and the second turn against a motion (or vice versa).

A. Quema felt that this motion meant that Senators had to position themselves as for or against a motion and as a result she would be voting against the motion. A. Quema felt that people needed to feel that they could speak freely.

B. Anderson had never seen this sort of approach before despite being involved in a lot of meetings, and wondered why a solution was being searched for something that had not been identified as a problem. B. Anderson was not in favour of the motion.

MOTION FAILED.

5) New Business

a) Conflict between
Constitutions

D. Holmberg explained that in examining the Constitution of the three Faculties, she had observed discrepancies between the three with regard to the appointment of Directors of Schools; and a conflict between two of the Faculty Constitutions and the Senate Constitution. Specifically, the Senate Constitution states that Senate appointees from Schools shall be “named by the School concerned and chosen in a manner determined by the individual schools.” In contrast, the FPAS Constitution states that all Schools shall be represented by their Directors, and the FPS Constitution states that one of the three representatives from each School shall be the Director. D. Holmberg noted that these discrepancies could be resolved by changing the Constitution of Senate, or by requesting that the Faculties change their Constitutions. D. Holmberg felt that although Senate does approve changes to Faculty Constitutions, she did not feel that Senate had the authority to direct individual Faculties to change their Constitutions. D. Holmberg suggested that she could send a memo to the Deans and Directors alerting them to the discrepancies, but wondered whether that would be going too far, or not going far enough.

A. Mitchell noted that he believed that the Directors were the academic heads of programs, which was why they were always Senators.

J. Hennessy noted that in his case he was voted onto Senate by the School of Music and that no one else was queuing up to take on the role. J. Hennessey believed that in the case of the FPAS and FPS, since all of the Directors were appointed to Senate, would that not mean that their appointment was approved by the faculty at such time as they approved the Faculty Constitution.

D. Holmberg noted that the changes to the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science Constitution were made around 2009, and that they were not presented to the FPAS as a change. It was assumed the changes were simply aligning the FPAS Constitution with the Senate Constitution; however, the changes were in fact aligning the FPAS Constitution with long-standing past practice, which actually seems to be in conflict with the Senate Constitution. P. Williams agreed to raise this matter at the FPAS Council meeting.

It was suggested by A. Quema that the Robert's Rules be left alone for a while!

A. Mitchell asked whether elections of Senate members should be across all departments, and whether departments are also guaranteed Senate representation.

D. Holmberg responded that according to the Senate Constitution, each Faculty gets 9 representatives to Senate, and within those nine representatives, every School is guaranteed at least one Senate representative. As to how the representatives are allocated across units within the Faculty, each Faculty has adopted a different approach, as outlined in their respective constitutions.

D. Holmberg now resumed the Chair and P. Doerr stepped down.

- b) Timetable, Instruction Hours and Examination Committee – Proposed Calendar Dates for 2013/2014 (*attached*)

Motion from the TIE Committee to approve the proposed calendar dates for 2013/14. Moved by A. Quema and seconded by E. Callaghan.

The Chair noted that Senate was approving and not just receiving the report from the TIE Committee. R. Jotcham was available to speak to any issues Senators might have.

D. Benoit noted that two study days had been inserted in November, making two long weekends during the fall term. D. Benoit noted also that many of his students tended to tack on extra days to a long weekend and therefore miss an additional day of classes. He suggested therefore that the University take the decision to provide a full week of study days at Thanksgiving, similar to the winter term study break, rather than having students taking extra days here and there.

R. Jotcham responded that this option had been considered, but that it was deemed too early in the term for a one week study break, as based on comments from the students.

J. Hennessey noted that Trent University has a study week during the fall term after Thanksgiving. J. Hennessey asked about the pre-exam study days which have been reduced from two days to one day.

R. Jotcham responded that because additional study days are being added earlier in the term, it pushes the term further into December. Also R. Jotcham noted that fewer exams are being scheduled, so that it was felt that one study day at the end of term was sufficient.

C. Stanley pointed out that since the study days on Nov 7th/8th attach to the Remembrance Day weekend, it would only create one long weekend in November.

D. Benoit responded that with the Thanksgiving long weekend in October, this created two long weekends in the fall term. D. Benoit noted that a

number of students leave early and return late, thus missing additional classes.

R. Jotcham noted that regardless, there would be a long weekend in November anyway, so that the situation described by D. Benoit could not be avoided.

C. Stanley stated that he was not overly worried about students taking extra time away from classes and felt that taking responsibility and covering the course work missed was something that students had to learn to deal with.

M. Rios agreed that many students at Acadia came from sufficiently far away to be unable to travel home for a long weekend. These students would favour a longer study break.

E. Callaghan was in favour of the extended long weekend and found that during the fall term most of her students remained at Acadia and appreciated the break, rather than taking a week away on holiday as happens with the February break.

J. Banks noted that the week in February is termed Study Week and that he would typically give work to the students during that time.

Motion to amend the last day to submit Honours Thesis for Spring Convocation from March 14th to April 7th, 2013 and to amend the deadline for approved Honours Theses for Spring Convocation from April 21st to May 1st, 2013. Moved by S. Major and seconded by M. Snyder.

S. Major spoke to the amendment and stated that in her view extension of the deadlines would improve the quality of the thesis. S. Major noted that many students are not able to work on their thesis during the summer and that the deadline of March 14th makes it harder for the students to produce the sort of high quality work that Acadia would expect. S. Major stated that when Research & Graduate Studies receive the thesis in March it is passed on to the external reader to primarily correct grammar and other presentational issues, rather than substantive issues. The external reader currently has until April 14th to complete this review and the vast majority of students receive very little substantive feedback from the reviewers. S. Major felt that too much time was provided for the external reader, some of which could be made better use of by the Honours student to improve the quality of the thesis.

S. Major noted that with the current process, in departments with a second reader, a student only had until mid to late February to respond to feedback from the supervisor, to allow time for the second reader to give feedback. Extra time working with the supervisor and second reader would be better than extra time allotted to the external reader. S. Major recognised that not all departments might want to extend the deadline for submitting Honours Thesis, but that some would wish to. Those who prefer the earlier deadlines can certainly maintain them as their internal department deadlines if they wish.

D. MacKinnon noted that while he was sympathetic to S. Major's proposal, he reminded Senate that the reason for the mid-March deadline was to separate submission of the thesis from the examination period. The proposed date changes would result in Honours students having to make changes to their thesis during the examination period and D. MacKinnon also felt that it would be hard to get external readers to commit during the examination period.

D. MacKinnon also noted that he attempts to match the thesis topic to the external reader, with the result that responses from the reader tend to be more substantive and go beyond grammatical corrections.

A. Quema was in favour of the amendment to the deadline because she sees students struggling with the deadline and also feels this to be stressful for the supervisors. A. Quema suggested airing the motion so that units could discuss it in more in detail, since some units may want this and some may not. This would give units time to think about this.

D. Holmberg stated that the way to do this would be with a motion to 'postpone definitely'. This would postpone discussion of the amendment and it would move to the top of the agenda at the January Senate meeting. D. Holmberg noted that the Registrar had indicated that there would be sufficient time to make the change in the University Calendar if this item was discussed in Senate in January.

Motion to postpone further discussion of these amendments to the January meeting of Senate, and move this to the first item of business. Moved by A. Quema and seconded by P. Williams.

P. Williams agreed that taking this back to the departments was a good idea.

MOTION CARRIED.

- c) Motion from the Graduate Studies Committee re: Policy on Compassionate Leave (*attached*)

Motion from the Graduate Studies Committee recommending that Senate approve the policy on Compassionate Leave. Moved by D. MacKinnon and seconded by J. Holt.

D. MacKinnon spoke to the motion and stated that this was one of the recommendations from the Graduate Studies Committee that failed to come forward to Senate some months ago, at a time when a number of other recommendations came forward.

T. Herman stated his support for the motion but questioned whether it would be within the purview of Senate to set fees.

The Chair agreed that this raised a good point and felt that to be true. The Chair asked whether this recommendation should therefore be returned to the Graduate Studies Committee for reconsideration.

D. MacKinnon pointed out that other recommendations from the Graduate Studies Committee had been approved previously with similar wording and were now in the University Calendar.

The Chair asked whether there would be a difficulty with timing if the recommendation was returned to the Graduate Studies Committee. It was agreed that the motion could wait until next month.

Motion to refer this request back to the Graduate Studies Committee for further consideration and possible amendment. Moved by T. Herman and seconded by D. Benoit.

J. Hennessey asked what the procedure would actually be for adding or removing supplementary fees from the calendar.

T. Herman responded that increases or decreases in fees would ultimately receive approval by the Board of Governors, because they would be incorporated into the proposed budget.

P. Williams noted that if students were no longer registered as full-time students, Student Loans would be contacting them for re-payment of outstanding loans.

D. MacKinnon did not recall whether there had been discussion of this particular point by the committee, but noted that this recommendation follow the policies in place at other universities. The committee would consider the issue as part of their potential amendment.

MOTION TO REFER TO COMMITTEE CARRIED.

d) Academic Program Review Committee – Prioritized Recommendations:

i) F.C. Manning School of Business (*attached*)

Motion that Senate approve the prioritized recommendations for the F. C. Manning School of Business. Moved by T. Herman and seconded by J. Hennessey.

T. Herman noted the lengthy delay in bringing these recommendations forward to Senate, and stated that he was pleased to bring forward the recommendations concerning planning, the program, resource allocation, staffing etc.

T. Herman noted that the nine recommendations being brought forward reflected content from the 17 original recommendations from the review. T. Herman explained that each one presented reflected in some way the original recommendations and detailed the number of the original recommendation(s).

T. Herman stated that when the APRC met with the Director of the School of Business, it was recognized that much time had passed between the time of the review and the present time, and that some of the recommendations had already been put in place.

T. Herman noted that the APRC liked the Core program and endorsed it. It was felt that the Core program was a unifying community building concept in the School. It was also felt that the introduction of four different majors creates opportunities for students, but has also created challenges for the School with the present staff constraints. The APRC recommended that the School continue with the Core program but also be aware of the student responses to the new majors and measure whether the new majors create undue stress on the program flexibility and staffing, or whether the increased diversity of the new majors outweighs those challenges.

T. Herman then opened the discussion up for questions, rather than continuing through every recommendation listed in the document.

D. Holmberg noted for the record that S. Major was not involved in any of the APRC discussions due to a possible conflict of interest.

A. Quema asked about the second recommendation, that the university consider establishing a new building for the School of Business.

T. Herman responded that he was delighted that Patterson Hall was now partially renovated and that many School of Business classes now are scheduled there. It was recognised, however, that renovations are not yet

complete and the APRC was encouraging the School of Business to work with the office of the VP Advancement and the School Advisory Board to get their own building in place.

A. Quema noted that other Business schools have their own buildings, an example being the Sobey's School of Business at St. Mary's, and that this can greatly affect enrolment.

T. Herman agreed that space is a defining element in programs and once again encouraged the School to establish its own building. Full accessibility was also of importance. T. Herman noted that Patterson now has the Centre for Rural Innovation on the 4th floor, which presents opportunities for students to work directly with emerging businesses.

J. Whidden noted that it took Dr. Patterson much of his 23 year tenancy to raise the money for the original Patterson building.

C. Stanley asked whether it was normal for a university to delegate the recruitment function to a School.

T. Herman responded that the APRC does support a model of integrated recruiting. The School of Business has been fully engaged in the recruiting process recently and has been quite successful in this area.

A. Quema referred to point 8; the degree of support that the School provides to its many international students and asked whether units across campus could work together to put support in place to alleviate some of the stress placed upon the School of Business.

T. Herman welcomed the suggestion of units coming together to work this issue. The APRC recommends that the VP Academic Office and Recruitment and Enrolment concentrate on further diversifying the international student enrolment and to take a strategic approach to international student enrolment. The APRC's comment in this case was recognition of the stresses and resource constraints that were a result of the disproportionate numbers of international students in the School of Business.

MOTION CARRIED.

e) President's Annual Report

The Chair stated that while reading the Constitution she had noticed that *copies of the President's Annual Report shall be sent to members of Senate after the annual meeting of the Board of Governors*. The chair did not recall ever receiving an annual report from the President while she was a Senator, and neither did members of the Senate Executive. As President Ivany was absent from the November Senate meeting, the chair asked him to provide a report for the December meeting of Senate. President Ivany stated that while he was happy to do this, he didn't do an annual report for the Board, so was unsure of what format this report should take.

The Chair then searched previous minutes of Senate for a model, and found that no Presidents' Reports had been presented to Senate since at least 1999. However, in the early 2000s, Senate did receive copies of the VP Academic's Annual Report.

T. Herman noted that the VPA's annual report is in fact prepared as a report for the Board and for Senate and is placed on the VP Academic web site. The

175 page report is a detailed summary of what is being done by the academic sector.

D. Holmberg wondered whether this report had replaced the annual report from the President to Senate and the Board.

T. Herman believed that this is what had happened.

The Chair noted, however, that the VP Academic report would have different content to an annual report from the President's Office, because the President's report is described in the Constitution as including reports from administrative officers and Presidential Advisory Committees. It seemed to go beyond the academic sector. The Chair was looking for options, and noted that she saw three possible avenues to follow, given that Senate had not received the report for over a decade:

- Remove this requirement from the Constitution
- Change the Constitution to say that the VP Academic's annual report would be required, instead of the President's report
- Request that the President provide an annual report as noted in the Constitution, with some guidance as to what such a report should look like.

President Ivany responded that while he would have no objection to providing whatever sort of report Senate would find useful, he noted that he does already report bi-annually to the Faculty, so that he would not wish to duplicate information. President Ivany also noted that there were inevitable constraints attached to the production of a written report that would become a matter of public record, compared to a verbal report.

J. Best noted that there had been an annual President's Report in the 1990s, containing items similar to the current VPA report, but with additional information.

T. Herman agreed that the annual report from the VP Academic morphed out of the previous President's Annual Report.

A. Mitchell noted that the President's Annual Report also used to contain detailed financial information, until President Ogilvie began to produce a President's report consisting of a calendar, with minimal detailed information.

E. Callaghan observed that she believed that President Ivany spent time thinking about what was happening in the broader scope of universities across Canada, and stated that information placing Acadia in such a national context could perhaps prove very helpful to faculty, and perhaps assist them in making better decisions in their teaching.

C. Stanley agreed that this was a good idea and suggested leaving it to President Ivany to identify what information to pass on to Senate.

The Chair suggested that the Senate Executive Committee could discuss the issue and come back to Senate with a recommendation.

Motion to refer the issue to Senate Executive. Moved by D. Benoit and seconded by E. Callaghan.

MOTION CARRIED.

- | | |
|--|---|
| f) Notice of Motion from Adam Foster, Graduate Student Representative
<i>(attached)</i> | A. Foster, the Graduate Student Representative to Senate, described the motion that will be brought to Senate in January 2013. This motion from the Acadia Graduate Student Association recommends changes to the selection procedure for the graduate student representative on the Research Ethics Board. |
| 6) New Business | None. |
| 7) Adjournment | K. Power moved a Motion to Adjourn 6:00 p.m. |

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Attachment 4) a)
Senate Agenda 10 December 2012

Motion #4, Regarding Vetting of the Wording of Recommendations or Motions

Background: Individuals or committees sometimes bring forward motions that are unclear. They also sometimes bring forward recommendations to Senate that are not in the form of motions, so that it is not clear what Senate is actually being asked to do to enact the recommendation. A great deal of time can be spent on the floor of Senate word-smithing motions, or trying to turn recommendations into concrete motions that can be voted upon. If items came to Senate in “motion-ready” form, it would likely save a great deal of everybody’s time.

Motion: That individuals or committees bringing motions or recommendations to Senate will consult with the Deputy Chair or the Chair first, to make sure the wording is clear.

Note: In general, individuals or committees making recommendations to Senate would be asked to reframe them as motions, making it clear what specific action they are asking Senate to take. Motions would be vetted only for clarity of wording, not for content. If movers did not agree with the suggestions made by the Deputy Chair or Chair, they could still bring forward their unrevised motion, but while speaking to it, should mention that the Deputy Chair / Chair made certain recommendations for wording changes, which they chose not to incorporate for such-and-such a reason. If the majority of Senators agree with the mover, the mover’s wording will stand; if the majority prefers the wording suggested by the Deputy Chair / Chair, it could be incorporated as an amendment without having to re-craft the wording from scratch.

Motion #5, Regarding Alternating Pro and Con Views during Debates

Background: Occasionally, Senate will spend quite some time discussing an issue, even though all or almost all of the discussion is on one side of the issue. To make sure that key points on both sides of the debate emerge as early in the discussion as possible, Robert’s (p. 379) recommends that “In cases where the chair knows that persons seeking the floor have opposite opinions on the question... the chair should let the floor alternate, as far as possible, between those favouring and those opposing the measure. In large assemblies, various devices are sometimes used to assist the chair in following this rule, such as having members seeking recognition hold up cards of different colors, go to different microphones ‘for’ or ‘against’, or the like.” Senate has never followed this procedure, to my knowledge, but it is a possibility.

Motion: That during debate, the Chair, as much as possible, alternates speaking turns between those in favour of a motion and those opposed to a motion.

Note: We would have to come up with a system to make this procedure work, but it would be do-able. We would need some kind of a signal as to whether people wishing to get onto the speaker’s list are for or against the motion (e.g., left hand up vs. right hand; one finger raised vs. two fingers raised; different coloured cards to hold up, if those systems don’t work well). I would then simply maintain two speakers’ lists, and alternate back and forth between them whenever there are speakers on both lists. The advantage to this procedure is that it gets ideas on both sides of the debate out quickly and efficiently. Also, if it becomes clear that no one has anything to say against a motion, for example, then Senators might decide to move to a vote early on, without spending time belabouring a point on which all agree. The disadvantage to this procedure is that it might lead people to choose sides too quickly, or terminate debate prematurely, without giving the discussion full opportunity to evolve.

Calendar Dates for the 2013/2014 – December 3rd – Senate Submission

2013	
June 17	Classes begin - Intersession 2 (Summer)
July 1	Canada Day - no classes
July 26	Classes end - Intersession 2 (Summer)
July 5 and July 26	Examinations - Intersession 2
August 28	Residences Open for New International Students
August 29	New Student Orientation Activities begin for International Students
August 30	Last day to apply to graduate at Fall Graduation
August 30	Last day to submit Honours theses for Fall Graduation
August 31	Residences open (for all New Students) / New Student Orientation Activities (full schedule for all New Students)
September 2	Residences Open - Returning Students
September 3	Graduate Student registration
September 3	New Student Orientation Welcome Week ends
September 4 (Wed.)	Classes begin - Fall Term
September 4	Fee Deadline
September 11	Last day for course additions for Fall and full year courses
September 11	Last day to drop Fall or full year courses without a "W"
September 20	Final Exam Schedule posted for December Examinations
September 23	Deadline for approved Honours and Masters' theses for Fall Graduation
September 27	Last day to receive grades for Fall Graduation
September 30	Last day to opt out of ASU Health Plan or add dependents
September 30	Last day to decrease Meal Plan for Fall Term
October 1	Faculty Meeting for approval of Fall Graduates
October 8	Senate meeting to approve Fall Graduates
October 11-13	Homecoming
October 14	Thanksgiving Day - no classes
October 25	Last day to drop 3h first term courses without a failing grade "F"

November 7 and 8	Fall Study Days – no classes
November 11	Remembrance Day – University closed and no classes
November 29	Last day for undergrads to apply for Spring Convocation 2013
December 2	Last day of classes before exams
December 3	Study Day
December 4	Examinations begin - Fall Term
December 17	Last day of examinations - Fall Term
December 18	Residences close at 12:00 noon
2014	
January 2	Residences Open (Winter Term New Students Only)
January 3-4	New Student Orientation
January 5	Residences Open - Returning Students
January 6 (Mon)	Classes begin - Winter Term
January 6	Fee Deadline
January 13	Last day for course additions and dropping Winter courses without a “W”
January 13	Last day to drop full year courses without a failing grade “F”
January 24	Final Exam Schedule posted for April examinations
January 31	Last day to opt out of ASU Health Plan or add dependents - Winter Term Students
January 31	Last day to apply for Spring Convocation 2013 for Graduate Students
January 31	Last day to decrease Meal Plan for Winter Term
February 17-21	Study Week
February 28	Last day to drop Winter Term courses without a failing grade “F”
March 14	Last day to submit Honours Theses for Spring Convocation
April 7	Last day of classes before exams
April 8	Study Day
April 9	Examinations begin - Winter Term
April 14	Deadline for approved Masters’ Thesis for Spring Convocation
April 17	Deadline for registration - Intersession 1
April 18	Good Friday - no classes
April 21	Deadline for approved Honours Theses for Spring Convocation
April 23	Last day of examinations - Winter Term
April 24	Residences close at 12:00 noon
May 1	Last day to receive grades for Spring Convocation
May 5	Classes begin - Intersession 1 (Spring)
May 6	Faculty Meeting to approve Spring Graduates
May 7	Senate Meeting to approve Spring Graduates
May 11	Baccalaureate Service

May 11-12	Spring Convocation
May 19	Victoria Day - no classes
May 30	Last day to opt out of ASU Health Plan or add dependents – 16-month Bachelor of Education Students
May 30	Deadline for registration - Intersession 2
June 2	Last day to submit an appeal to the Academic Appeals Committee
May 23 and June 13	Examinations - Intersession 1 (Spring)
June 16	Classes begin - Intersession 2 (Summer)
July 1	Canada Day - no classes
July 25	Classes end - Intersession 2 (Summer)
July 4 and July 25	Examinations - Intersession 2 (Summer)

Attachment 5) c)
Senate Agenda 10 December 2012

The Graduate Studies Committee recommends that Senate approve the following policy on Compassionate Leave:

Graduate students will be provided with compassionate leave for a period of up to one year in the case of the death or serious illness of a family member. This leave is not intended to cover circumstances related to travel, employment, or other financial concerns. Once on leave, students will not be registered with the University, nor will they be required to pay tuition or continuing fees. However, students may choose to maintain computer network, email, and library access during the period of the leave by paying a \$100.00 fee. Financial support from University sources will normally be suspended during the period of the leave and, where possible, will be reinstated upon completion of the leave. It is the responsibility of the student to determine the status of funding from all external sources.

**Academic Program Review Committee –
Recommendations arising from the Review of the Manning School of Business
November 23, 2012**

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) met initially with the School's Director, Dr. Ian Hutchinson on December 16, 2010 to discuss the unit's November 4, 2010 written response to the review. The Committee met again with Dr. Hutchinson on June 5, 2012 to update the APRC on relevant activities that had taken place in the unit in the interim. The Committee has formulated the following recommendations to Senate. These reflect the report of the review team, the departmental response to that report, and the updates on activities in the unit provided by its Director. A copy of the review and the Department's response, as well as the APRC's prioritized (from highest to lowest) recommendations below will be made available to Senate. Numbers in () refer to the number of the recommendation in the original review document.

1. *Continue with the 'core' program and pursue the proposed majors in finance and human resources as soon as possible. (3)*

The Committee acknowledges that the CORE concept is one of the defining features of the business program at Acadia, and strongly endorses its continuation. It helps students identify their path for the remainder of their degree and their careers beyond graduation. Faculty members in the School are supportive of the outcomes associated with a CORE concept; it helps build community and unites the discipline.

The majors in finance and employment relations (human resources) are now available; so too are majors in business technology management and entrepreneurship and innovation. The Committee acknowledges the loss of flexibility in staffing due to current constraints, and encourages the School to monitor student response to gauge whether the increased diversity of major options outweighs that loss of flexibility in staffing.

2. *The University should consider establishing a new building for the business school as a top capital campaign priority. (13 & 15)*

The School and its advisory committee should explore strategies for fundraising with the Office of Advancement to complete the renovation of Patterson Hall. The Committee strongly encourages an integrated approach to fundraising coordinated with the Dean and the VP Advancement.

3. *The University should collaborate with the Business School in establishing an enrolment objective for the School. It should also delegate the recruitment function to the school and in doing so provide performance incentives. (2)*

The School now meets regularly with Recruitment staff to increase their awareness of the business programs. The unit is also fully engaged in recruiting efforts when prospective students are on campus. The Committee supports a model of integrated recruiting where the unit is an active participant. The Committee supports the goal of 600 students in the unit. This is consistent with the school's history, capacity and with regional demand.

4. *Inclusion of the School in the University's Strategic Research Plan and recognition of the research needs and accomplishments of the School. (9&10)*

The Committee supports these recommendations. The new Institutional Research Plan consultation process that has been introduced by Research and Graduate Studies should

provide an opportunity to the School to have input into the definition of the university's research agenda. The Committee also recognizes that increasing the profile of, and support for interdisciplinary research on campus will elevate the awareness and importance of research contributions from the School.

The University Review Committee is highly aware of the importance of recognizing diversity in the scholarly culture and in ways of assessing productivity. The URC should continue to look to individual units for advice and guidance in this regard.

5. *The Cooperative Education program should be reviewed so that the issues identified in this report are addressed. (7)*

The Committee strongly supports this recommendation, which is both timely and relevant. Coop and international experiences have great potential for business students. The Committee encourages the School to continue to involve its advisory committee in this important area, and to continue to overcome impediments to pursuing such experiences (e.g. scheduling conflicts, placements, evaluation, access to upper level courses). The Committee also notes the positive impact that moving the office of one of the two co-op placement officers into the School has had on awareness of the program among faculty and students, and on uptake.

6. *Develop a policy or guidelines as to what the ceiling on class size should be. (5)*

The Committee recognizes the high level of student satisfaction with instructional experiences in the School, and would encourage the School to continue to seek ways to maintain innovative pedagogy and programming. The Committee recommends that any efforts to identify ceilings should take a course-specific approach to class size based on particular pedagogies and some measure of their effectiveness.

7. *The School should initiate a formal planning process with an explicit statement of goals and strategy (1), and a proactive plan for assessment of program effectiveness, including development of explicit program objectives with measurable outcomes so as to facilitate continuous improvement of the program. (6)*

The Committee recognizes that since the review was filed, an iterative and dynamic strategic planning process was launched and is in progress; the Committee applauds this development. In response to the call to identify and adopt success metrics, the Committee commends the School for its proactive approach, grounded in data, and encourages the School to continue identifying metrics, including data on performance of graduates, and to collect and assess those metrics appropriately.

8. *The Vice-President Academic and appropriate bodies should review the supports given to foreign students at Acadia. (8)*

The Committee recognizes that the School has provided and continues to provide an admirable degree of support, at significant human resource cost, for its many international students, which account for a disproportionate number of Acadia's total international student population. It also recognizes the importance of a university-wide strategy for international recruitment and support structures for international students, and encourages the Vice-President Academic and the Vice-President Enrolment and Student

Services to continue their collaborative efforts to diversify international enrolment and identify optimal capacity.

9. *Access for disabled students needs to be addressed. (17)*

The Committee recognizes that this has been addressed in part with the partial shift of the School's activities to Patterson Hall. Timely completion of the Patterson renovation will allow full implementation.

Motion from Adam Foster, Graduate Student Representative to Senate, on behalf of the Acadia Graduate Student Association (AGSA)

Background: There are currently discrepancies in documents as to whether the graduate student who is chosen to sit on the Research Ethics Board is to be selected by the AGSA or the SRC. It is suspected that initially, the student was to be chosen by the AGSA, but because it has occasionally not existed in a given year, the SRC stepped in to choose the student. The AGSA has discussed the matter and believe that, whenever possible, the graduate students' representative should be selected by graduate students. However, taking into consideration that the AGSA has not existed every year, and there is no way to ensuring that situation won't arise again, we wish to include in this motion that the SRC will be able to choose the representative if the AGSA does not exist in any given year.

The Acadia Graduate Student Association recommends that Senate approve the following amendment to the membership of the Research Ethics Board:

- i. 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 **Acadia Graduate Student Association. In the event the Acadia Graduate Student Association is not able to select a representative in a timely fashion in a given year, the appointment shall be made 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 member from the community with no affiliation with 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.