

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday, September 10, 2012 beginning at 4:00 pm with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 41 present.

1) Approval of the Agenda

The Chair corrected item 6 c) on the circulated agenda to read ‘Notice of Motion from the **Vice President Academic** of the Acadia Students’ Union re: Senate Membership’ rather than ‘Notice of Motion from the **President** of the Acadia Students’ Union re: Senate Membership’. It was moved by S. Major, seconded by A Smith that the agenda be approved as amended. There were no objections to adding an additional item to the agenda. Item 6. a) becomes a Report from the Nominating Committee regarding Committee Chair Vacancies. This item is a special order for 5:50pm.

MOTION CARRIED.

2) Minutes of the meeting of
18 June 2012

It was moved by J. Hennessy, seconded by A. Smith that the minutes of the meeting of 18 June be approved as distributed. It was moved by P. Doerr and seconded by W. Slight that comments by H. Kitchin on Page 6 be amended to read: ‘H. Kitchin did not support the motion and stated that a mandate cannot be “*evolving*”. *She thought that if we were to move towards a non-representative model, we may have to rewrite our constitution in order to accommodate this committee as it is being recommended. There is an interpretive space in our constitution that suggests that committees necessarily be representative, and if you look at all of the standing committees, every single standing committee is representative.*’

A. Quéma questioned why this change was necessary. The Chair explained that H. Kitchin felt that the summary in the minutes misrepresented the point and wished for a direct quote to be used instead. Amendment approved.

MOTION CARRIED.

3) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

Regrets were received from E. Callaghan, E. Cochrane, P. Hobson, H. Kitchin, G. Poulter, and M. Snyder.

The Chair stated that J. Postema would no longer be taking minutes during Senate meetings freeing some of her time for other

duties in the President's Office. The Registrar will be taking minutes on an interim basis.

D. Holmberg welcomed the 18 new members of Senate. Robert's Rules of Order will be used for the meetings. In the case of a tie vote on a motion, the Chair will normally vote to defeat the motion. Those wishing to speak should raise their hand so the Chair can create a speakers list. Senators can speak twice, for 10 minutes each time for each item being discussed. People who have not had the opportunity to speak to the issue will be given priority over those who have spoken before. Questions are welcomed at any time when clarification is needed. There is no need to be placed on the speakers list when asking a question regarding process. Last name and title will be used during discussions for clarity. Meetings normally adjourn at 6pm unless a motion to extend is approved by a 2/3 majority.

Over the summer, elections were held to fill positions on the Academic Planning Committee. Elected were: D. Duke, T. Weatherbee, D. McMullin, and K. Power.

A link to the updated membership list and description of Senate committees was recently circulated by the recording secretary; a link to a timeline of the Senate annual cycle was also provided. An early draft of a Senate Handbook has been sent to members. Suggestions and comments regarding the Handbook are welcome.

A Senate orientation will be held in BAC 132 on Monday, October 1 at 4:00pm; the orientation will likely be about one hour in length. All new Senators are encouraged to attend; veteran Senators are also welcome. Possible changes to make Senate work more effectively will be discussed.

P. Doerr, Deputy Chair assumed the chair so that D. Holmberg could report on her meeting with P. Jewer, Chair of the Board of Governors concerning pan university planning. D. Holmberg presented some background on the matter. Senate has been discussing planning for about two years. The TTTCAC requested that Senate help them establish priorities as no sense of an overall academic planning model with defined goals was evident. No committee was found that looked at planning. The matter was referred by Senate to the Senate Executive who recommended the formation of the APPC. After extensive discussion the ad hoc committee was formed to exist for one year. That committee looked at planning as it existed now and consulted widely with the academic community. The committee recommended a standing

committee of Senate be formed which has now been done. One recommendation of the ad hoc committee was that planning be pan-university rather than confined to the academic sector. It was seen as important that both the financial and academic aspects of decisions be considered together. Therefore the Chair of Senate was instructed to meet with the Chair of the Board to discuss this approach. Before the meeting D. Holmberg contacted the APPC for background information. She reviewed appendix B of the APPC report as well as information on planning committees from Queens and Western Universities. Of the 16 committees (14 from appendix B, Queens and Western), 9 were Senate committees, 2 were joint Senate and Board committees and 5 followed other models. Some were primarily academic, others mainly financial, while still others were both and several consisted of subcommittees that on occasion met together. A joint Board/Senate committee was quite rare.

On August 21 the Chair of Senate, the Chair of the Board and President Ivany met. It was felt by both Chairs that having the President at the meeting would be valuable as he is the chief liaison between the two governing bodies. The meeting was collegial – all parties were on the same page regarding the importance of joint planning for reasons of both practicality and principle. It was also agreed that academic goals and priorities were of central importance and that closer communication between the two governing bodies would be a good thing. As there are currently a large number of committees associated with both bodies it was hoped that perhaps an existing committee could be used. On the Senate side the APC is already in place. This seems to be of reasonable size and membership. The APC can propose plans, goals and ideals for further consideration. On the Board side, the Academic Resources Committee (ARC) could be used to look at matters from a resource standpoint. The APC could make recommendations to Senate but at an early stage in their deliberations they would discuss the matter with the ARC. There would likely be an iterative process undertaken by the two committees, likely with a joint recommendation or resolution coming forward to both governing bodies. It was agreed that this proposal would be presented to both the Board and Senate for consultation and further discussions would be held if the governing bodies agreed with the proposal in principle. P. Jewer did note that the ARC has not proven to be a very functional committee to date. He sees this as an opportunity to revitalize the committee, and is open to changes in membership and/or mandate. This meeting and the discussions held were reported to the Governance committee of

the Board, who were open to considering any changes that Senate might propose.

D. Holmberg invited questions and comments.

W. Slights asked if this Board committee was the only one that might work. D. Holmberg agreed that there might be others but this one seems to have the mandate closest to what would be needed.

A. Quéma commented that it was important to try. It is always possible to make changes if the proposal does not work. However, she had concerns about the APC and how it would function. Where are they going to start and what will be the process? If the collaboration is to work, faculty must be behind the APC. D. Holmberg agreed.

T. Herman agreed that A. Quéma raised a good point. The APC is recently formed with the first meeting scheduled for September 19. While the committee will work to carry out its mandate it should also be sufficiently flexible to welcome suggestions and unsolicited discussion papers so that it deals with issues that faculty consider important. The smaller size of this committee may avoid some of the issues such as logistics that complicated the task of the APPC.

S. MacDougall stated that she is encouraged by these developments and considers the more open lines of communication between the Board and Senate a good thing. It is now a matter of working out the details.

J. Stanley said that as a Board member on the ARC he felt that the committee needs a firmer mandate. This proposal will help give that committee a stronger role.

G. Phillips stated that she is encouraged by the continued discussion.

D. Holmberg concluded that, regarding next steps, the general consensus of the room seemed to be to carry on with discussions in this vein. P. Jewer will meet with the Board and gauge their response. Then the Chairs will come up with specifics and report back.

D. Holmberg thanked Senators for their input and resumed the Chair.

Members were then invited to introduce themselves providing their name, the group they represent and how long they have served on Senate.

b) From the President and Vice-Chancellor

R. Ivany reported that he will be reporting at subsequent meetings on the progress of the MOU with the province and on AUCC activities but at this meeting he would like to look forward to the upcoming year.

A number of dynamics are at play. The O'Neill Report is still informing policy in Nova Scotia including the MOU negotiations. Over the next several years institutions like Acadia will either be marginalized or we will define a space for what makes Acadia important in the Canadian context. We do not fit the framework that granting councils, among others, have defined, where bigger is better, undergraduate education is less important than graduate, and research can only be delivered on a large scale. None of this fits with a high quality liberal education provided by Acadia and a few others; we are swimming upstream. This has implications for funding in NS. The work of the APC is important and should involve the entire campus. Over the next year or two we must advance a framework for dialogue to establish what we want to be. Senate is the place where these decisions must be made. We will have routine business to conduct but often the most value comes from the non-routine. Senate must find time for these discussions.

c) From the Vice-President Academic

T. Herman highlighted several research-related activities that have taken place over the summer. The Research Station at Beaubassin was opened recently, with over 300 people, including the Prime Minister, in attendance. This is a collaborative venture with Acadia, Ducks Unlimited and Irving Oil. The work being done there is transdisciplinary in nature and the Acadia researchers involved come from a variety of disciplines. Acadia received good national coverage from the event.

The Acadia Tidal Energy Institute will officially open on September 11 and all Senators are invited to attend. This Institute is the culmination of over 100 years of tidal research at Acadia.

On September 8 Acadia celebrated the signing of a conservation easement to protect Bon Portage Island. This is the first conservation easement between a land trust and a university in Canada. All of these activities highlight how deeply rooted Acadia is in our community, and the importance of the space we have

carved out while remaining true to the values and vision of our founders.

A. Quéma stated that a student reported two homophobic attacks. Events such as this have educational as well as personal implications at an institution that wants to be welcoming and to create a place where all members of the community can thrive.

S. Lochhead confirmed that Student Affairs staff will gladly work with this or any student. Should anyone hear of such events, they should contact her and her staff will reach out to the student. These matters are very serious and are treated as such by the sector.

S. Lochhead provided an update regarding Access Copyright. Acadia has signed the Access Copyright agreement. Although a number of its provisions were a concern, it was decided that mitigating the risk to the university and its members outweighed those concerns. A copy of the model agreement and a question and answer document were circulated earlier. The agreement was different in some respects to the one available at the time of the June meeting. University librarians in the region are meeting in October to discuss the agreement. AUCC is coming forward with a framework in light of the Supreme Court decision. Access Copyright has decided to move forward with interrogatives with all universities who did not sign.

C. Stanley asked how many universities signed on in the end.

S. Lochhead replied that most signed the agreement including all of the Nova Scotia universities and 2 of the 3 in NB.

R. Jotcham reported on of the beginning of term statistics that were available to Senators for their review. She pointed out that the statistics are preliminary, but that Acadia has the largest enrolment that it has enjoyed in several years.

D. MacKinnon announced a day of research celebration has been scheduled for November 16. The theme will be Industry and Community Partnerships. Events will be held throughout the day in the KCIC with panel discussions and interactive displays. Four theme areas will be highlighted: Tidal Energy, Health and Wellness, Social Diversity, and Food and Wine.

- 4) a) Senate Committee Annual Reports
- These reports were discussed at the May meeting, but the motion to receive them was not voted on at the time. Therefore, it was moved by R. Murphy, seconded by B. Moody that the reports be received.

MOTION CARRIED.

- 5) a) Motion from the Chair, Honorary Degrees Committee
- It was moved by R. Ivany, seconded by J. Hennessy. R. Ivany spoke to the motion. This motion is to codify changes discussed a year ago at Senate in the name, membership, and mandate of the Honorary Degrees Committee, to better capture its activities in judging Professores Emeriti. (APPENDIX A)

MOTION CARRIED.

- b) Academic Program Review Committee Prioritized Recommendations

It was moved by T. Herman, seconded by J. Banks that the recommendations for the School of Engineering be approved. T. Herman spoke to the motion. This report was brought forward last year but sent back to the Committee for clarification of priority 1 when concern was raised at Senate by the Director of the School over the wording of that recommendation. In consultation with the Director, the text was modified. The following text was added to the first sentence of the description following the recommendation: 'into a four year program'. This removed the vagueness from the original wording that concerned the director. He endorsed the new wording. (APPENDIX B)

MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by T. Herman, seconded by S. Major that the recommendations from the review of Environmental Science be approved. (APPENDIX C)

T. Herman commented on the submission. He acknowledged that this review was important for several reasons. Environmental Science began as an interdisciplinary program without a home department and has evolved into a part of the Department of Earth and Environmental Science. The Committee applauds those from both the environmental science and geology groups. Both have made significant compromises and adjustments for the other. Environmental science and geology honour and respect the needs and concerns of each other; their model is a success. This is reflected in the fact that our environmental science program was used as a model for the national accreditation process for similar programs at other universities. However, there are still issues alluded to in the report. For example, how does Acadia address

interdisciplinary programs and how should they be governed. The current model works well in this case. It is important for an interdisciplinary program to create a sense of home and identity. Further examination of governance issues for interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary programs would be valuable.

MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by T. Herman, seconded by B. Moody that the recommendations from the APRC relating to the Department of English and Theatre be approved. (APPENDIX D)

T. Herman acknowledged that this report is longer than the others. The committee has responded to all 33 recommendations made by the review team. The committee agreed that it is important to allow flexibility in the way that reports are prepared. Therefore responses will vary as well. He highlighted the priority recommendations at the end of the committee's report.

J. Hennessy stated because he sits on the committee he has been part of the discussions around the last recommendation (i.e. possible creation of a School of Fine and Performing Arts). While such a change in structure would need to be very well thought out, he agreed that it had potential.

A. Quéma agreed that unit reviews are important, but they do bring out tensions within units. The information in these reports is relevant to the APC. For positive results, the APC must take these reports into account. T. Herman concurred.

MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by T. Herman, seconded by C. Stanley that the recommendations regarding the Department of Languages and Literatures be approved. (APPENDIX E)

T. Herman explained that the review was discussed with the acting head and another representative from the unit. The committee met a number of times to consider the unit response and to formulate recommendations. The recommendations were reviewed for Senators.

J. Best explained that this was the first review for the unit since the three language departments were amalgamated in 2000; it was the first review of any of the language sections in over 20 years. Overall the unit was pleased with the review and agreed with the

report. A lot of work has been done to harmonize the requirements for the three majors and toward the university goal of internationalization. The unit expressed some concern that French, German and Spanish were all similarly characterized as foreign languages. It was hoped that French would be recognized with the special status of one of Canada's official languages and therefore be referred to differently. The unit was also disappointed that no reference was made to the drop in faculty complement from 10 to 4.5. While it is acknowledged that this cannot be addressed at the moment, it was hoped that there would be a reference to it in the recommendations. Collaboration with other units is difficult because courses are offered in the original language. This is a feature that the unit does not want to compromise. However, there is a willingness to explore the possibilities while recognizing the difficulty of maintaining the viability of the programs.

The recommendation of a year away from Acadia for all French majors is a concern for the unit. There is a worry about the effect that practice would have on numbers. The time abroad is necessary for majors in German and Spanish but not for French majors.

J. Best alerted Senate to the fact that the review was conducted in 2009 and recommendations were based on the situation at that time; enrolment has subsequently increased.

A. Quéma commented on the difficult task that the review team had to report on 3 sections. The intent of the reviewers was to address program viability. They thought that more resources were needed to ensure program viability and that cross appointments would be one way to achieve that. She confirmed that the reviewers made no negative comments about the research carried on by unit members, only on the visibility of that work.

T. Herman agreed that the APRC was not commenting on the calibre or volume of scholarly work, only on its visibility. He also noted that the APRC recognized the special status of French but didn't make that point in their report.

MOTION CARRIED.

6) a) Report from the Senate
Nominating Committee

J. Hennessy moved that W. Brackney be nominated as Chair of the Senate Library Committee. The Chair called for additional nominations from the floor. As there were none, W. Brackney was elected by acclamation. J. Hennessy reported that the TTTCAC needs a chair. J. Guiney Yallop was elected in error in May. In spite of this, he continued in the position and presented the

committee's report.

b) Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee Report J. Guiney Yallop noted that he had received confirmation from T. Herman that no tenure-track searches would be authorized for the upcoming year. Therefore, as agreed at the June meeting, the TTTCAC would not proceed with its annual ranking procedures. The report contained information on units requesting positions, for Senate's records. (APPENDIX F)

c) Report on Senate Membership Discrepancies in the By-laws It was moved by B. Anderson, seconded by C. Stanley that the recommendations in the document attached to the agenda be approved, and that the Chair of Senate and the By-laws Committee be asked to work together to implement the recommendations. (APPENDIX G)

It was noted that there may be additional notices of motion after conversations with the Board to determine whether their approval is required in a number of cases and with the Faculty of Theology regarding the voting process for electing their student representative. The attached Notice of Motion from the student Vice-President Academic regarding voting status for the Student President was the first motion arising from these recommendations.

D. Benoit asked if three years is the maximum term for Senators. D. Holmberg clarified that 3 years is the standard term of office for elected Senators but not for those who sit on Senate by virtue of their position, as in the case of Deans and Directors. In these cases, the term is established by the position they hold. D. Holmberg agreed to look into updating the relevant membership lists to make it clear that Directors serve on Senate ex officio, and therefore their term on Senate corresponds to their term as Director.

MOTION CARRIED.

7. Adjournment

On motion of J. Hennessy, the meeting adjourned at 6:03pm.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Rosemary Jotcham
Secretary to Senate

Motion from the Chair, Honorary Degrees Committee:

That the Constitution and By-laws of the Senate of Acadia University, Article VIII. (h) be revised to reflect the new Terms of Reference as approved at the September 2011 meeting of Senate, as indicated below:

- VIII. (h) ~~HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE~~
AWARDS COMMITTEE FOR HONORARY DEGREES AND EMERITI DISTINCTION (AWARDS COMMITTEE)
- i. The membership of the ~~Honorary Degrees~~ **Awards** Committee shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:
- The President, Chair
 One member of the Faculty of Arts
 One member of the Faculty of Professional Studies
 One member of the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science
 One member of the **Acadia Divinity College**/Faculty of Theology
One member of the Library
 One lay member of either the Senate or the Board of Governors appointed by the Board
 One member of the student body to be designated by the Student Representative Council *
- ii. The ~~duties~~ **purpose** of the ~~Honorary Degrees~~ **Awards** Committee shall be **to**:
- a. ~~To solicit and receive suggestions for honorary degrees from the University community and to make recommendations thereon to Senate;~~
- b. ~~To receive, through the President, nominations for the appointment of Professores Emeriti and to make recommendations thereon to Senate.~~
1. **Invite nominations for Honorary Doctorate degrees and Professores, Librarian, and Archivists Emeriti awards.**
 2. **Adjudicate the nominations; and**
 3. **Recommend nominees thereon to Senate.**

**Academic Program Review Committee
Prioritized Recommendations for Senate 2011
The Ivan Curry School of Engineering**

The Academic Program Review Committee has reviewed both the recommendations outlined by the Review Panel Report for the Ivan Curry School of Engineering and the School's Response to the Review Panel's Report.

The APRC's prioritization of recommendations incorporates consideration of Acadia's current fiscal climate. Recommendations of the Review Panel that have already been addressed in whole or large part are included after the prioritized list, with annotations. The following are presented in order of priority:

Priority 1:

More emphasis on the three year program with the possible development of a four year degree program is recommended to provide engineering students greater opportunities for research and collaborative studies with other schools such as computer science, physics, mathematics, and earth science and environmental science.

The APRC recognizes the importance of the optional third year in the BASC/CAS program but would not encourage expansion of the three year program **into a four year program**. The School should be encouraged to continue the existing 2 and 3 year programs preparing students to complete their Engineering degree at partner institutions. The APRC would encourage the exploration of a 4-year integrated inter-disciplinary program in Applied Science; this would elevate the profile of the school internally, enhance research opportunities for faculty in the School and create a unique program for Atlantic Canada. It would also provide additional opportunities for students in physics, computer science, chemistry and mathematics and statistics.

Priority 2:

The University should provide new targeted funds, based on academic excellence in Engineering and related disciplines, to support the research of undergraduate Engineering students under the supervision of Engineering faculty members.

APRC acknowledges this concern and encourages the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science to work with the Division of Research and Graduate Studies to develop a mechanism to provide access to funding to these students. To this end, consideration should be given to accessing the Foulis endowment for such support.

Priority 3:

The University should maintain at least its current level of support for access to the Engineering literature via the resources managed by the Vaughan Memorial Library.

We encourage the School to continue its efforts to expand its interaction with the Library to ensure that appropriate library resources are available to meet program requirements.

Additional recommendations already addressed in whole or in part (numbers below refer to original report from Review Panel):

“The Foulis Chair in Engineering must be given top priority and filled as soon as absolutely possible. This position will provide a strong link between, and enhance research opportunities with engineering and other academic units such as, physics, computer science, math and earth and environmental science.”

The APRC concurs with the review’s top priority – the University has since established the new Named Chairs and Endowed Chairs policies and is pleased that the Chair will be filled by Dr. Jennie Rand effective July 1, 2011.

The new guidelines for endowed chairs have clarified and formalized the procedures for appointments of all chair holders and allocation and reporting of endowment funds. These guidelines should adequately address the other concerns raised by the Review Committee regarding the status of the Foulis Chair.

4. The University should address the deferred maintenance issues that have led to the poor quality of existing research space in Carnegie Hall.

The APRC recognizes the importance of this issue, which is widespread and affects most units on campus. In the School of Engineering, these issues are in part being addressed specifically by allocation of funds tied to the Foulis Chair.

5. In concert with the statement in Strategic Plan the University should identify research space that would permit faculty members in the School to adequately build research programs that would make them more competitive in obtaining external research funds.

This issue is in part being addressed specifically by allocation of funds tied to the Foulis Chair.

7. The university should continue to provide budgetary support to maintain the Interdepartmental Workshop facility as a key component of the Engineering education at Acadia.

For Engineering's requirements, the facility appears to meet the needs of the School but at present does not have the capacity to provide this service across campus.

8. The University should continue to provide an office for the IRAP representative in Carnegie Hall as an important resource for both undergraduate teaching and research activities of the School.

We have continued to maintain the IRAP representative.

Academic Program Review Committee – Recommendations arising from the Review of Environmental Science (ENVS)

May 26, 2012

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) met on April 26, 2012 with Ian Spooner, Coordinator of the Environmental Science Program and Rob Raeside, Head of the Department of Earth and Environmental Science, to discuss the report of the review team and the program's response to the recommendations of the external review team. The Committee met again on April 27 to formulate its report to Senate which was finalised at a meeting on May 25. A copy of the report of the review team and the program's response as well as the APRC's recommendations will be made available to Senate.

This program has achieved considerable success through recognising the importance of fostering good relationships within a formal structure. Current participating units have recognised the authority of ESPAC (Environmental Science Program Advisory Committee - an intra-Acadia committee with representatives from all participating units) through an organisational adjustment to ensure that the Coordinator is accountable to the Chair of ESPAC. The Academic Program Review Committee suggests renaming ESPAC to reflect the nature of its purpose as a program committee with authority, and supports the further development of roles and responsibilities for the Chair, Coordinator and members to complement the terms of reference and descriptions of roles that are already in hand. The Faculty of Pure and Applied Science modified its constitution to include the ESPAC Coordinator in curriculum and budget discussions. The Department of Earth and Environmental Science is to be commended for amending its mission statement to ensure that it complements that of the program. This offers a shared vision for the Department of Earth and Environmental Science, while recognising and accommodating the interdisciplinarity of the program.

Recommendations one through seven have been thoroughly addressed immediately following submission of the reviewers' reports, and faculty have been resourceful in managing program development within current constraints. We recognise that the program faces significant teaching capacity challenges. The reviewers expressed concern that the Coordinator was not supported by a budget; there is now a modest budget allocated to support this role. The APRC lauds the Environmental Science program for responding to the recommendations regarding planning by holding more frequent meetings, developing a planning structure and successfully integrating units/disciplines. The emerging relationship between ENVS and Environmental and Sustainability Studies is positive; the Committee celebrates this and encourages further collaborative efforts, including building on existing relationships with the Nova Scotia Community College.

The governance model developed by ENVS appears to be effective for them currently. The APRC recognizes the importance, and challenge, of maintaining a sense of home and creation of identity in sustaining interdisciplinary programs and lauds the success of the ENVS program in accomplishing this. The APRC will contemplate governance models for trans-disciplinary programs along with its consideration of the review of the Women's and Gender Studies Program. The APRC recognises the urgency of developing broader governance models for transdisciplinary programs. The

coordination of teaching duties, leaves and other workload issues are among those that present challenges for such programs since they draw on a diverse array of individual units.

Participants in the program are proactive about addressing student/curriculum issues; students have an integral role in planning discussions in the program. Faculty are mindful of providing a positive and significant experience for students, regardless of program evolution. After a period of development, this program reached a state of maturity such that it was used as the model for establishment of pan-Canadian standards. Graduates of the program have been very successful, both in regard to employment and achievement in graduate studies.

Priority Recommendations

The APRC:

1. Encourages the Dean and other units in FPAS to explore use of faculty resources from cognate units to support this program;
2. Supports building on existing internal and external collaborations;
3. Encourages the completion of formal Terms of Reference for the program;
4. Recommends renaming ESPAC (Environmental Science Program Advisory Committee) to ESPC (Environmental Science Program Committee).

Academic Program Review Committee – Recommendations arising from the Review of the Department of English and Theatre

May 18, 2012

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) met on March 23 2012 with Dr. Patricia Rigg, Head of the Department of English and Theatre Studies to consider recommendations made by the review team and the unit's responses to those recommendations. On May 18, 2012 the APRC met to consider recommendations to Senate taking into account the review and unit's responses. A copy of the report of the review team and the unit's responses as well as the APRC's recommendations will be made available to Senate. The Committee acknowledges that in the interim period since the review the department and the university have effectively addressed many of the recommendations. Following the numbering of the review team's recommendations, we comment below directly on each recommendation from the Review. At the end of the document, the APRC highlights four important recommendations in order of increasing priority.

Recommendation 1: The University ensure that the position of Administrative Assistant be replaced at the same level of administrative authority.

The position of Administrative Assistant has been filled since July 1, 2011.

Recommendation 2: The University provide uninterrupted access to computers and email accounts to part-time faculty with successive, although not necessarily continuous, appointments within the Department.

This recommendation was accomplished through provisions of the Collective Agreement.

Recommendation 3: The University endeavour to ensure part-time faculty that teach regularly within the Department (i.e., every year) be recognized for their commitment. Suggestions to accomplish this include expediting application procedures for returning faculty, providing an option for inclusion in benefits programs, and providing access to professional development monies.

This recommendation was accomplished through provisions of the Collective Agreement.

Recommendation 4: The University provide funding to create a second course for second-language learners as a follow-up course to English 1306. Funding for this position should not come from the Department of English and Theatre budget, given the course would provide campus-wide support for non-majors that will potentially benefit students of all disciplines.

The course ENGL 2313 (Advanced English Composition for International Students) was offered during the 2011/12 academic year for the first time. Eleven students took the course.

Recommendation 5: The University restore the funding for student assistantships to its previous level.

We recognize the pressures on limited TA resources across the entire campus. This underscores the need for their strategic allocation in units with the greatest need.

Recommendation 6: The University restore recently lost funding for visiting speakers and writers.

This recommendation was accomplished in part through provisions of the Collective Agreement. The APRC also applauds the efforts of the department to collaborate with other universities in the region to attract speakers.

Recommendation 7: That the Arts librarian and a student representative be encouraged to attend department meetings in order to facilitate the work of the Arts Librarian and to allow students an official voice in departmental discussion.

The committee agrees with the decision to include the subject librarian at full departmental meetings and encourages the unit to enhance student involvement at meetings.

Recommendation 8 & 9: At the earliest opportunity, the University advertise for a Theorist with competence in American Literature and/or Cultural Studies; The University maintain the Department's faculty complement at 15 tenured or tenure-track positions.

The APRC supports the unit's philosophy of hiring. When opportunities arise to fill positions the committee encourages the unit to be responsive to whatever may be the most pressing need at that time.

Recommendation 10: The University recognize and celebrate the excellence of the English program.

The APRC agrees with the recommendation. The university continues to recognize and celebrate the excellence of the English program at all opportunities.

Recommendation 11: The University continue to support and value the MA program in English and enable it to increase annual intake to 6-8 students through the provision of one or more additional funding packages per year.

The APRC recognizes the strength of the graduate program but acknowledges that the availability of internal funding is not likely to expand in the near future. We encourage the unit to explore ways to maintain critical mass.

Recommendation 12: The Department should develop a process for encouraging and mentoring graduating-year English majors to apply for the SSHRC CGS for MA students.

This recommendation is being addressed through Scholarly Methods sessions as well as through initiatives from the Division of Research and Graduate Studies.

Recommendation 13: The Department recruit English teachers in the region's school system for its MA program.

The APRC suggests further study of the question regarding recruitment of English teachers to the MA program.

Recommendation 14: The Department add one more blended graduate and Honours course per year and consider increasing the frequency of course offerings in areas of the greatest student interest (as shown through application proposals and actual thesis projects).

The APRC encourages the use of blended honours and graduate courses as they have potential to enrich the experience of students in both programs.

Recommendation 15: The University move to make the .5 movement post a permanent position.

This has been done. The APRC would like to note that five music students are permitted to take the movement courses; this is a good example of collaboration between units and the use of a course to meet the needs of more than one program.

Recommendation 16: The University modify its fundraising policies to include the Theatre program as an area that could receive targeted donations.

The university continues to pursue and welcome targeted donations in all programs, coordinated and managed through the Development Office.

Recommendation 17: Due to the central importance of the contribution to the theatre program by the Department's administrative assistant, the reviewers cannot stress strongly enough the need for the University to consider her retirement replacement at a professional level correspondent with that held by the current incumbent.

This position has been filled.

Recommendation 18: It is suggested the theatre faculty consider the particular interests and aptitudes of individual professors in their delivery of different levels of the acting courses, with a view to assigning particular levels to particular professors rather than the current practice of automatic rotation every year.

The APRC agrees with the response of the unit to this recommendation and applauds the diversity of experience for students and faculty that this approach provides.

Recommendation 19: We appreciate the inclusion of MUSI 1333 (Vocal Workshop) in the performance program as a way of furthering vocal training and encourage the inclusion of other courses from cognate disciplines.

This course is accessible to all students but is not a requirement of the theatre program.

Recommendation 20: The movement courses are well appreciated in general, but it would be useful to clarify how the different levels relate to each other and whether they can be shaped to provide clearer progress and differentiation. It would be ideal if the content in the two classes could differ more obviously, in order to give students a broader taste of what they might need in the profession.

This issue has been addressed.

Recommendation 21: Present facilities and numbers of production students make it hard to justify the addition of production courses; however, to ease the time pressures experienced by the Technical Director during work on productions, we suggest finding budget adjustments to acquire occasional part-time assistance in the shop to help with student supervision.

This issue has been addressed for the coming year.

Recommendation 22: To increase contact hours without increasing credits, it is suggested the sector explore the possibility of adding lab hours to acting and production courses.

The APRC agrees with the unit response and recognizes that there is already substantial contact between students and faculty.

Recommendation 23: One area that students did express concern about was the small number of credits earned for their obligatory production work (THEA 1001 and THEA 2002). Is there a way to increase the credits for these two courses?

The APRC recognizes that this issue often arises in professional and performance programs. We are satisfied with the way the department presently allocates credit.

Recommendation 24: In order to stabilize the number of incoming students at the optimal 20 per year, it is recommended that the University revisit its policies on limiting program participation in off-site student recruitment. The theatre program is unique, and effective recruitment requires the direct input of the professionals involved in the delivery of the program.

The APRC encourages the theatre faculty to participate directly in recruiting if they wish. The university will support these efforts as appropriate.

Recommendation 25: Library resources are generally adequate for student work in theatre academic courses; however, in the practical areas, professors find they need to supply their own materials. It is imperative the University address the need for library funding that reflects the real and changing needs of the theatre sector.

Faculty members are encouraged to submit orders to the library. Resources are ordered only if they are requested.

Recommendation 26: Given the scholarly work of the theatre professors, one wonders why they have not been more utilized in the supervision of Honours and Masters thesis projects and why they have not participated in offering Honours and Masters seminars. We believe

they would make a valuable contribution to these levels of the Department's teaching and scholarship, and they should be encouraged to contribute to these upper-level courses.

The APRC recognizes the potential benefit of having Theatre faculty supervise Honours students when circumstances allow, and encourages exploring these opportunities.

Recommendation 27: The University should, ideally, set aside a six-week period during the school year when no rentals are scheduled in ATF and when the space is available exclusively for the needs of one major ATF production. This production should be selected so that it will attract a large number of audience members, serve as many Acadia Theatre students as possible, and also play a role in the curriculum of the Department of English and Theatre. A performance of a well-known Shakespeare play, for instance, would at the same time serve as a useful recruitment tool for high-school students, fulfill the express wish of the Acadia Theatre students for studying and performing a classical play, and would also be a perfect vehicle for community outreach.

The APRC agrees with the unit's response. At present the Festival Theatre Building is a multi-use facility and as such presents logistical and resource challenges to meeting this recommendation.

Recommendation 28: Considering that the Acadia Theatre Company's current, edgier productions sell around 800 tickets during a two-week run, it is not unrealistic to assume that a more conventional choice of play would attract a substantially larger audience and perhaps enable the company to be able to stage a week-long run in ATF even without reducing the size of the house. With these kinds of box-office proceeds, the Theatre budget would no longer be in deficit, and it is quite possible that the loss of rental income would also be offset. At the same time, a combination of one popular, large-cast, and one smaller, more experimental production per year would not only give the season a nice balance, but would also provide a perfect pedagogical background to the Theatre section's curriculum. In other words, if carefully planned, moving one production to ATF would not only improve public visibility of the Department, but would also further add to the excellence of its practical education.

The APRC recommends that the unit and the School of Music explore ways to optimally use upper Denton Hall, lower Denton Hall and the Festival Theatre Building for productions and performances.

Recommendation 29: It should not be too difficult to schedule such a production in a time-slot when rentals tend to be low and thus further minimize any potential financial risks. If either the University or the Department feel that one major production per year is too ambitious a project at this point in time, one production every two years on the ATF stage could initially be scheduled. Though this is a compromise solution, it would still enable every generation of students to experience the invaluable opportunity of being able to test their acting skills and technical training on a large, well equipped stage, and in this manner prepare them for future careers in professional theatre.

The APRC agrees with this recommendation but would recommend exploring the use of a different venue.

Recommendation 30: It is essential that a small but modern lighting board be bought for the Acadia Theatre Company: recommended is an ETC Express or another ETC console with similar capabilities. It is not huge or fancy, but is standard in a lot of theatres across the country. To graduate a student in the Production stream without exposing him or her to a computerized lighting board is akin to graduating a biology student who has never been given access to a microscope. While a lighting board is a significant investment, it will pay itself off in the long run and will make the students' education much more credible.

This recommendation has been met through a gift from a generous donor.

Recommendation 31: The Acadia Theatre Company also needs a dedicated washer and dryer, where students' costumes could be cleaned after each performance.

The APRC encourages the unit to explore the possibility of using washing facilities elsewhere on campus.

Recommendation 32: A small budget (in the range of a few hundred dollars) could be set aside annually for regular replacements of outdated and potentially dangerous power tools.

The occupational health and safety officer checks tools and equipment regularly and items are replaced as needed.

Recommendation 33: A dedicated parking space in front of the Dental Hall should be provided to the Technical Director, so that deliveries of supplies do not become a source of endless personal frustration.

The addition of a part-time technical assistant should help alleviate this problem. However, the APRC will recommend to the Parking Committee that it approve the request for a dedicated parking space adjacent to Denton Hall.

Priority Recommendations (in order of increasing priority)

1. Although the review did not address this matter, the wish to retain present courses caps was raised by the unit head on behalf of the department during her meeting with the APRC. Recognizing the value of a first-year English course to students in their first year of university, the committee encourages the unit to explore pedagogy around the first year level courses given current resource limitations.
2. Students attend a part of the bi-weekly meetings with Theatre faculty. In keeping with the direction Senate has taken, the committee encourages the unit to explore ways to more formally engage students in departmental processes including attendance at full departmental meetings, while reserving the right to hold in camera sessions as appropriate.
3. Given the Department's concerns about critical mass in the Graduate Program in English, the Committee suggests exploration of non-traditional delivery in the Graduate Program, including the effective use of blended honours/graduate classes. The APRC encourages the Department to expand recruitment of graduate students to include more individuals who are not recent graduates from full-time undergraduate programs (e.g. Teachers of English, Community College Educators, Mature Learners).
4. Throughout the review and the review process it was evident that the two programs, English and Theatre Studies, are relatively autonomous, without an apparent shared vision. We recommend that the Dean of Arts, the School of Music, and faculty members in Theatre Studies explore the possibility of a school of fine/performing arts at Acadia.

Academic Program Review Committee – Recommendations arising from the Review of the Department of Languages and Literatures

May 18, 2012

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) met on February 10, 2012 with Acting Head Robert Proulx and Janice Best, Department of Languages and Literatures, to discuss the department's response to the review, and to update activities in the department. The Committee met on March 16 & 30, April 27 & May 18, 2012, to discuss the response and consider recommendations to Senate related to the review of the Department of Languages and Literature. The recommendations are in response to the report of the review team, taking into account the departmental response to that report. A copy of the review and the Department's response, as well as the APRC's priority recommendations below will be made available to Senate.

- 1. Collaboration** – The Department is encouraged to develop ways to increase pedagogical and scholarly collaboration among the sections, building on the successes to date. To this end, we applaud the recent joint appointment to the German and Spanish sections and agree with the Department in its opposition to the criticism of the cross appointment by the review team. The Committee recommends collaborations with other academic units to avoid the duplication of courses and to allow cross-listing of various courses to enhance the opportunities for majors.
- 2. Internationalization** – The Committee recognizes the importance of the Department in realizing the university's obligations to internationalization as articulated in the Acadia Strategic Plan. We applaud the significant role this unit has played in this endeavor, but recognize that success to date of the institution as a whole in this area has been limited. This Department should continue to play an important part in realizing the university's commitment to internationalization. Building on the successful year abroad for German and Spanish majors, the exchange opportunities for French majors, and the presence on campus of the lecteur/lectrice positions in French and the PAD position in German, the department is well positioned to, and should, play a larger leadership role in internationalization.
- 3. Standardization of Programs** -- The number of courses required for majors within each of the three sections has been standardized in terms of credit hours required. However, the experience of each group of majors is very different, as those students majoring in German and Spanish are required to spend their third year abroad in order to complete their requirements while French majors are not. The unit is encouraged to explore requiring all French majors to spend their third year in a French-speaking environment to allow their students the same opportunities and benefits enjoyed by the students in the other two sections.
- 4. Research Activity** – We agree with the Department that scholarly activity by its members needs to be publicized more widely and effectively. The members should continue to build and promote the culture of scholarship and mentoring within the Department.

- 5. Faculty Appointments** – The Committee agrees with the Department that the recent cross appointment between German and Spanish has been a success and would encourage this as a future direction, with the possibility that in this way other languages might be introduced to the department. The Committee also supports the Department’s program of lecteur/lectrice and PAD positions. They enrich the Department, engage students in language acquisition, contribute to the internationalization of our campus, and raise the profile of the Department across the campus and in the community. The Committee recommends that the Department consider carefully the effective use of these valuable resources, including more flexible allocation of these resources across the three sections. The Committee finds the recommendation of additional tenure-track positions unwarranted, particularly under present resource constraints and enrolment patterns.
- 6. Program Viability** - The review did not address the issue of the viability of delivering programs with small numbers of majors. We encourage the unit to explore the sustainability of their Spanish and German major programs and to examine innovative approaches to curriculum delivery. We request the unit to report to Senate on this recommendation within six months of the approval of this report of the APRC.

Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee

Report to Senate September 2012

On July 31, 2012, I received the following message from Dr. Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic:

In accordance with the procedural guidelines of the TTTCAC, I am notifying you in your capacity as Chair that regrettably no tenure-track searches will be authorized for 2012-13.

Therefore, as decided at the June Senate meeting, the TTTCAC will not be performing its ranking procedures this year, unless circumstances change.

Appended to this report, you will find the brief requests from units, listed in the order in which they were received.

Respectfully submitted,

John J. Guiney Yallop, Chair (Interim)

From Dr. Andrew Biro:

[T]he Department of Politics wishes to make a case for the approval of **two (2) tenure-track positions in our department**. This is the same request that we (then the Department of Political Science) made last year. Part of the case for these positions has to do with the integrity of our teaching of the discipline: The fields of International Relations and Political Thought are essential to the teaching of Politics/Political Science, and we have been left with holes in these areas with the retirements of Drs. Grieve (IR) and Pycz (PT) in 2011. The other part of the case rests on student demand (numbers): POLS FCEs and majors are both continuing to increase, despite the shrinking faculty complement in our department. Over the last year, the stresses created by this increased workload have become increasingly apparent.

From Dr. Paul W. Doerr:

The Classics unit of the History and Classics department would like to request a tenure-track appointment to replace Dr. Beert Verstraete, who retired on July 1, 2011. We strongly believe that three full time professors are needed to maintain the Classics program which has been a part of Acadia since its origins and which continues to attract students to its courses, including Latin and Greek.

The History unit of the History and Classics department would like to request a tenure-track appointment to replace Dr. Barry Moody, who will be retiring next June, and who is not teaching courses in the department this year due to his commitments as Dean. This appointment is necessary to maintain the overall strength of the department which continues to draw large numbers of students.

From Dr. Rob Raeside:

The Department of Earth & Environmental Science requests the position vacated by L Lusby in 2011 be filled. This position is required to provide courses and thesis supervision in the policy and legal areas of Environmental Science, where the department currently has no expertise. This component was part of our successful accreditation process in 2010, and its lack will jeopardize our status with ECO. Courses no longer offered are ENVS 3113, 1643, 3313 and 4423 and 1023 can only be offered by overload teaching.

From Dr. Jeff Hennessy:

The School of Music requests a tenure track replacement position in Historical Musicology. Music History is a major portion of the curriculum in all music degrees and is currently taught almost exclusively by part-time faculty leaving us the only comprehensive music school in the country without a full-time music historian.

From Dr. Rene Murphy:

SRMK TTTTAC position requests for 2012-13

An Athletic Therapy position in Kinesiology (replacing Dr. Susan Markham-Starr). This person would be instrumental in developing the Canadian Athletic Therapy Association (CATA) certified program at Acadia and would greatly increase the number of students who could be trained in the Sport Injury Assessment and Management (SIAM) program. As this is the major draw for incoming KINE students, increasing the capacity will also help maintain enrolment into the future. Moreover, Acadia would be the only program east of Montreal delivering a certified athletic therapy program in Canada (and there is a huge demand for this to occur).

A replacement position for Dr. Wendy Bedingfield to teach in the Kinesiology program and most likely work in the area of Physical Education and Sport. The current Kinesiology curriculum is only a few courses short of being able to be accredited for Physical Education. If we added this individual, we would anticipate drawing new students to Acadia who currently choose to go elsewhere to gain the training to eventually become PE teachers/ coaches. As coach education will be moving to the University setting in Canada, Acadia could lead in the Atlantic provinces by beginning to implement this in its curriculum.

A position to replace Dr. Brenda Robertson's position in the BRM. This person would have expertise linking and crossing Recreation Management, Community Development and Sustainability. Due to the two retirements in the BRM faculty, the complement has gone from 5 to 3 (with a 9.5mo CLT for this academic year) and is not sustainable, especially with the 3 full time faculty members heavily involved with the ESST program.

From Dr. Barb Anderson:

The School and Nutrition and Dietetics, which currently has a total of three tenure/tenure-track positions (including the Director of the School), requires an additional tenure-track position to support our growing enrolment, to address the research demands of the Centre for the Sensory Research of Food, and to build a consumer food stream for students as an integral component of the Nutrition and Dietetics program. With our steadily increasing student enrolment (a 70% increase from 2004 to 2011), and our high student to faculty ratio, the School of Nutrition and Dietetics is challenged to meet program demands, therefore hiring a tenure-track faculty member to strengthen our teaching, research and community service will continue to ensure program viability, and allow us to enhance what is acknowledged as a high quality undergraduate program.

From Dr. Darcy Benoit:

Given the retirement of Dr. Rick Giles, our School has been left with 6 faculty members and currently runs in danger of losing our specialization in Game Development and having to greatly reduce our intake of MSc students. Our loss of faculty over the past several years, combined with a first year class that has been growing in size for the past several years, puts us in a position where a tenure track faculty member would be a great asset to the School and Acadia.

From Dr. Peter McLeod

The Psychology department requests a position to replace Dr. Lachlan McWilliams, who resigned unexpectedly on June 21st 2012. The Psychology department is amongst the largest on campus in terms of students served (e.g., largest first-year class sizes on campus; third in FCE% across Arts & Science), and has also been one of the fastest-growing departments in recent years (e.g., biggest average FCE% increase across campus last five years), yet is already relatively understaffed (e.g., substantially lower faculty complement than other units that teach comparable numbers of students). The loss of Dr. McWilliams will increase our already-large class sizes, threaten the existence of our popular Applied Psychology Option (N=24 students), and almost certainly result in us having to suspend admission to our very successful 64 year old graduate program in psychology, which trains a substantial proportion of the practicing clinical psychologists in the province.

From Dr. David F. Duke:

I write to you in your capacity as Chair of the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee (TTTCAC) to request, under Articles 1.3 and 1.6 of the document "Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee (TTTCAC) Procedures, Criteria, and Timelines, June 2012", a formal request for an Addition to Complement for the Environment and Sustainability Studies Program (ESST). Currently there are no faculty positions directly attached to this program, despite it accumulating more than 70 majors as it moves into its third year of operation.

From Dr. John Eustace:

Below is the rationale from the Department of English and Theatre for our request to hire an 18th Century Literature specialist:

Two unfilled positions have necessitated a ten course cut from English offerings. Given increased enrollments, we are struggling to offer core courses in 18th Century Literature and Introductory English.

From Dr. Ian Hutchinson:

APPLICATION: For authorization to fill a tenure-track appointment to teach Accounting

RATIONALE: The Manning School currently offers twelve courses in the area of Accounting. All but one of these courses are recognized by each of Canada's three professional accountancy bodies and may be used to garner advanced standing in educational programs leading to the professional accounting designations (CA, CGA, CMA). We are at risk of losing this advanced standing status if we are unable to offer these courses. The advanced standing status is paramount in attracting students to our accounting major, one of the most popular majors in the School.

From Dr. Romira Worvill:

The French section of the Department of Languages and Literatures would like to make a case for a tenure track position and you will find my justification below.

The French unit has recently lost two tenures stream positions: one due to an unanticipated early retirement (December 2010) and the other resulting from the decision not to renew a probationary tenure-stream contract (June 2012). These two departures, coming on top of other position losses, will have a significant impact on our service courses and on our Major programme. We are losing four sections of the entry-level language courses that students need to meet Core requirements and we are now unable to offer the advanced language courses that are a requirement for the French major.

From Dr. Jim Sacouman:

SOCI requires 2 tenure-stream positions that are rank-ordered as follows:

1. Beginning in 2013-14, in the area of Sociological Methods, both Qualitative and Quantitative (a position formerly held by Phyllis Rippeyoung). The courses to be covered are a required central requirement in all of our programmes (Major, Honours, Masters); the position was vacated by Phyllis Rippeyoung.
2. Beginning in 2014-15, a position in Ethnocultural Diversity and Racialization (a position formerly held by Kurt Bowen). This position is a crucial component of all Sociology and Anthropology programmes in Canada and we now have no dedicated scholar in the field.

Report on Senate Membership Discrepancies in the By-laws

By: Diane Holmberg, Chair of Senate

Barb Anderson, By-laws Committee Member

As reported to Senate last year, the Chair noted several discrepancies between various membership lists for Senate. After consultation with the By-laws Committee, it was agreed that Dr. Holmberg and Professor Anderson would investigate these discrepancies and report suggested resolutions to Senate. Each issue is identified below, along with a recommended solution.

There are four different places where the membership of Senate is outlined:

List A, on pages 1 and 2 of the list located here:

http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/senate/Committees%20and%20Membership/COM12-13.pdf, is an itemized list, identifying each member of Senate by name and role, along with “Procedures for Appointment”, noted below. The Procedures for Appointment seem to be compiled partially from the By-laws, partially from Faculty constitutions, and partially from past practice. This list has traditionally been the one used as a guide to following vacancies on Senate, and thus best represents current practices.

List B, on the bottom of page 2 of the document noted above, is labeled “Makeup of Senate”, and outlines the overall composition of Senate. It seems to be a slightly abbreviated version of List C.

List C, located on page 2 of the Constitution and By-laws of Senate, located here:

http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/senate/Constitution%20ByLaws/CompleteSenate.BylawsJanuary12.pdf, lays out the full composition of Senate. As this list is in the Constitution, it best represents how things “should be” (unless it is discovered that properly approved changes in Senate were not reflected in this copy of the Constitution).

List D, located on page 38 of the Constitution, is labeled “Appendix A – Membership”. It provides a historical record, by laying out the composition of Senate as established in May 1985, and noting any changes since then.

Please note that any changes to “the composition of Senate or the term of office of any of its members or the composition of the Executive Committee of the Senate or the term of office of any of its members” requires 30 days’ notice given to Senate, followed by a 2/3 majority vote in favour of the motion, AND 30 days’ notice to the Board of Governors, followed by a 2/3 majority vote.

Issue #1

Lists A, C, and D refer to the “Vice-President, Student Affairs”, while List B refers to the “Provost”. Both titles are outdated, as the position is now called “Vice-President (Enrolment and Student Services)”.

Recommendation #1

Change the current title in all four lists. The change to List C will require Notice of Motion and a formal vote in Senate, as it is a change to the By-laws. The other lists can follow, once approved.

A check via e-mail with the Chair of the Board of Governors to see whether this change would be interpreted as a “change in the composition of Senate” is required. Most likely the answer is, ‘no,’ but if yes, approval from the Board of Governors is required too.

Issue # 2

Lists A, B, and C refer to the “Chief Financial Officer”. List D uses the correct current term, “Vice-President, Administration.”

Recommendation #2

Change to the current title in lists A, B, and C. The change to List C will require Notice of Motion and a formal vote in Senate, as it is a change to the By-laws. The other lists can follow, once approved.

A check via e-mail with the Chair of the Board of Governors to see whether this change would be interpreted as a “change in the composition of Senate” is required. Most likely the answer is, ‘no,’ but if yes, approval from the Board of Governors is required too.

Issue #3

The Chief Financial Officer / Vice President Administration is noted as a non-voting position in Lists A, C, and D. It is not indicated as being non-voting in List B.

Additional Information

List D indicates that the position was changed to non-voting status at the April 1999 meeting of Senate. Those minutes are not available on-line, so we have not corroborated this statement ourselves, but have no reason to doubt it. The position has certainly been a non-voting one in recent years.

Recommendation #3

Change List B to indicate the non-voting status of the position, as its omission on that list appears to be an oversight.

Issue #4

There are discrepancies in the voting status of the Faculty of Theology representative. Lists A and C both refer to the Dean of Theology plus one Theology representative, who is not explicitly noted as non-voting, and therefore is presumed to have voting status. List B refers to the Dean of Theology (within the "Four Academic Deans" category), plus one voting rep AND one non-voting rep from Theology. List D notes that the category of "27 members of faculty" was increased to 28 with the addition of a member of the Faculty of Theology, who is normally to be non-voting, but will have voting rights when the Dean is absent. It further notes that the section about voting rights had not been approved by the Board.

Additional Information

A search of past Senate minutes showed that on May 9, 2007, Senate passed a motion to grant voting status to the member from the Faculty of Theology. Specifically, the member's designation as "non-voting" was to be removed from List C. The minutes of September 10, 2007 note that the Board of Governors approved this change.

Recommendation #4

Update lists B and D to reflect the correct status, i.e., Theology is represented by the Dean and by one voting member from Theology. No need for By-laws changes or Board involvement, as it was previously passed.

Issue #5

Lists A, B, and C refer to both the University Librarian, and a professional librarian, elected by the professional librarians. There is no mention of the second position in List D.

Additional Information

The minutes of May 9, 2007 indicate that Senate passed a motion to add "A professional librarian from among members of the University Community holding appointments as professional librarians" to the membership of Senate. The minutes of September 10, 2007 note that the Board had approved this addition.

Recommendation # 5

Update list D to reflect the addition.

The voting status of the ASU Student President (voting vs. non-voting) is unclear. Lists A, B, and C do not indicate that it is a non-voting position, implying it should be voting. List D specifies it as a non-voting position. List C has a footnote indicating that voting status was conferred August 2007.

Additional Information

An electronic search of the minutes indicates that the ASU President was added to Senate membership as a non-voting position in September 1999. This addition was confirmed by the Board, as announced at the November 1999 meeting of Senate. Electronic searches of the minutes from 1999 - present have so far not yielded any indication that the status was ever changed to voting; however, we may just not be using the right keywords. The footnote indicates that voting status was conferred in August 2007, but there was no Senate meeting in August. The minutes for September 2007 indicate the Board had approved the voting status of the professional librarian and Theology reps, but there is no mention of the ASU President.

Recommendation #6

Given that three of the four lists suggest the position is a voting one, that seems the most likely intent, and it has been treated as a voting position for some years. The student Senate reps should bring forward a motion to confer voting status on the ASU President. The change will have to be approved by the Board of Governors.

Issue #7

There is no clear indication in any list of how the Faculty of Theology Student representative is to be selected. There are also some other possible inconsistencies across lists in the specifics of student representation and election. List A lists seven student positions in total: The President of the Student Union (ex officio), then six others are named with specific roles: The Student VPA, one grad student, and one student from each of Arts, Professional Studies, Science, and Theology [note that it is not specified whether the latter four students would necessarily be undergrad or grad students]. List B refers to the President, Student Union, plus six students (no further specifics). List C refers to the Student Union President plus six other students, at least one of whom shall be a graduate student (no further specifics). List D includes the President of the Student Union in the list of ex officio members. It also notes that there shall be five (not six) additional student members in one place; however, it does indicate six additional student members in another place. It also notes that the Board of Governors at its October 1992 meeting recommended (but did not require) that one of the additional students shall be a graduate student.

Note that election procedures are also potentially problematic. In both Lists A and C, it states that undergraduate Students shall be appointed by Acadia's SRC, and graduate students shall be appointed by the Graduate Student's Association (list D states that it is recommended that the graduate student be selected under the auspices of the GSA). The Theology student (who will most often be a graduate student, but could possibly be an undergraduate) is not explicitly covered in either group, and it is unclear who has traditionally chosen this representative. Furthermore, under the current wording, "at least one" of the additional students should be a graduate student, but in theory it could be more, or even all, graduate students – there are no places set aside explicitly for undergraduate students, even though in practice the ASU has for a number of years appointed four of the students.

Additional Information

The September 10, 2007 minutes contain a motion to “change the entry [in the Constitution and By-laws] starting with “Five students...” to read: “Six students, at least one of whom shall be a Graduate Student.” The stated rationale was “to include another student on Senate, in order to allow for the SRC Theology Representative to have a seat.” Note there is no longer a Theology Representative on the SRC, as they now have their own student association, the Acadia Divinity College Student Association.

Recommendation #7

- (a) Change to one portion of List D to accurately reflect the increase to six students (plus ASU President). All other lists, and the motion from September 2007 noted above, state that the correct number is six, not five.
 - (b) To increase clarity, change list C to further delineate the breakdown of the student representatives. Have the list specify that members shall include the Student Union President (ex officio), plus four undergraduate student representatives, one graduate student representative, and one student representative from the Faculty of Theology (total = ASU President plus 6 additional students, as is current practice). As this change does alter the specified membership of Senate as per the Constitution, it will require both Senate and Board of Governors approval.
 - (c) Change the Constitution, Part III bullet point 4, to include the process for selecting the Theology Student representative. This change to the Constitution will require Notice of Motion and Senate approval.
 - (d) Clarify existing voting procedures, as needed. The graduate student rep will continue to be chosen by the Graduate Student Association, as is current practice. Five undergraduate student reps will come from the SRC, as is current practice. One of the reps is the President of the SRC who is ex-officio on Senate and the SRC is free to choose / allot the other four positions as they wish. The tradition has been to have one seat for the student VPA, and one seat for a student rep from each of the three Faculties; however, that breakdown is simply tradition, and not mandated by Senate’s Constitution. The SRC could change their internal allotment in future without consulting Senate, if they so desire. For clarity, update the “Procedures for Appointment” section of List A to indicate that fact.
 - (e) Update all lists to indicate changes recommended in 7b and 7c, if and when approved.
-

Issue #8

In List D, when listing the membership of Senate, it states that one member shall be “the Dean of Theology (or the Associate Dean)”. No other list mentions the Associate Dean. Furthermore, there is no longer an Associate Dean of Theology (although there is an Academic Dean).

Additional Information

In an electronic search of Senate minutes back to 1999, the only mention of an Associate Dean was in 2000, when the Associate Dean of Theology, who had been acting as the Senate rep, resigned.

Recommendation #8

Remove the reference to the Associate Dean from List D. With two voting reps from Theology now, the need to have an alternative representative is reduced. The Dean of Theology is welcome to invite the Academic Dean, or any other member of Theology, as a guest to speak to Senate when their expertise would be valuable.

Issue #9

List A states, accurately, that there are 57 positions in Senate, including the Deputy Chair; those 57 positions are currently filled by 55 persons (Paul Doerr is both a Faculty of Arts rep and the Deputy Chair; Sara Lochhead is both the University Librarian and VP Enrolment and Student Services). List B does not state the number, but it works out to 56 positions, as it omits the Deputy Chair. List C does not state the number, but it works out correctly to the 57 positions. List D states that there are “55 members” of Senate. The number of ex officio members is stated as being 18, but should be 19 if you include the Deputy Chair (but note, the Deputy Chair will also always be a faculty rep, so the number of persons will always be at least one less than the number of positions). The number of “elected members” (i.e., faculty members) is stated as being 28, but should be 29, as the professional librarian was omitted.

Recommendation #9

For clarity, note in lists B and D that there are 57 positions in total, but the number of persons may be less than the number of positions. Add the Deputy Chair to List B. Add the Deputy Chair and the professional librarian to List D.

As Dr. Holmberg cannot make motions in Senate, Professor Anderson moves that:

Senate approves the recommendations as outlined in this document, and asks the Chair and the By-Laws Committee to work together to ensure the changes noted are acted upon.