



A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 14th January, 2013 beginning at 4:10 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 45 present. The meeting was moved to BAC 244.

1) Approval of Agenda

Before the motion to approve the agenda was moved, the Chair detailed a possible change to the agenda.

Item 5) a) i and ii, the “APRC Prioritized Recommendations for both the Jodrey School of Computer Science, and the School of Recreation Management and Kinesiology”. 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.

Motion to approve the agenda as revised. Moved by J. Banks, seconded by S. Major.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

2) Minutes of the Meeting of
10th December, 2012

Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 10th December as distributed. Moved by J. Hennessy, 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 H. Gardner, A. Vibert, and Gwen Phillips.

The Chair welcomed everyone and thanked R. Hare for taking the minutes again. She noted that J. Postema continued to be the Recording Secretary for all Senate-related activities other than minute taking, and would therefore handle all agenda items and requests for information.

The Chair reminded the Senators that she had met recently with P. Jewer to discuss whether the changes to the Senate Constitution with regards to membership discrepancies would require Board approval. P. Jewer took the question forward to the Governance Committee. They wish to check previous minutes, as they think that even minor changes have in the past been brought forward to the Board for approval. It is therefore likely that the changes to the

Senate membership list will go to the Board for formal approval; however, no objections are expected.

The Chair reported fully on a recent Senate Executive meeting.

President's Report: She noted that with regards to the President's Report, a trip to the Archives resulted in information going back to 1938. The Chair noted that from the 1970s to 1990 there was a report from the President to the BoG and Senate. This included a cover letter from the President, listing the major highlights of the past year and detailing any new directions. In addition, reports from all of the VPs with information on everything that had happened in their sectors were included.

The Chair noted that within a year of K. Ogilvie becoming President, the report changed from being a report FROM the President TO the Board and Senate, to a report TO the President from various sectors on campus. By 2000, this report had ceased to exist altogether; however, it is still a requirement of the Senate Constitution. The Senate Executive discussed possible formats for a revitalized President's report. , President Ivany was prepared to provide a fuller report to Senate in electronic format, with links to yearly reports from each VP, providing summaries of information in their sector, mostly in the form of tables or graphs. The information would be provided, at the end of the academic year, i.e., June 30th, for the previous academic year, and made available to Senate in September. The Chair raised points from the previous Senate meeting regarding the competitive environment and the need to be cautious of what information was made publicly available, either in public reports or Senate minutes that become public. The Chair stated that one option would be for Senate to go into *committee of the whole* during sensitive discussion, which would then not be minuted.

The Chair noted one other point that President Ivany had raised; that, given our bicameral governance structure, a comprehensive report would, by definition, include items that may extend beyond the purview of Senate. The Chair stated that the Senate Executive felt that this was a reasonable approach and that if there were no objections, this approach would be used on a going forward basis; it could be revisited in the future if need be. There were no objections.

Minors on Transcripts: The Chair noted that in March 2010, Senate passed a motion requesting that minors show on final transcripts, but it turned out that this was not put into effect. The Chair followed up with the Registrar, the Senate Executive, the VPA and the President. The current PACE form was unable to show a minor, as the available field was already taken up by double majors and students do not officially 'declare' their minor at any time. The Chair reported that a change would be complicated to program; that Acadia only has one staff member assigned to programming Eden; and that there is already a considerable backlog of programming work for that one programmer. It was also felt that the University would migrate away from Eden during the next three to five years and over to Datatel.

The Chair suggested that one alternative would be to have students write their minor or their *application to graduate* form and that the minor could perhaps be manually entered into the transcript database. The Chair noted that the VP Academic will study the issue and report back at the next Senate meeting.

The Chair noted that this raised a second issue, that being that if Senate took a decision for action of some sort and asked someone or some committee to carry out that action, it was also important to have a mechanism in place whereby some individual was responsible to report back to Senate, and to ensure that the action was carried out. If the action had encountered problems, these needed to be outlined so that a plan for a solution could be developed. After discussion at Senate Executive, the Chair suggested that when an individual or committee was asked to take some action by Senate, the responsibility to report back to Senate would be assigned to some individual, and a timeline for an initial report would be assigned. The Chair would then be proactive in checking with the assigned individual and requesting a report to Senate at the agreed time. Because this represented a change in the normal procedures, the Chair will bring a motion regarding this issue to Senate in February.

The Chair asked if there were objections to her extending her report by a further five minutes. No objections were voiced.

D. Benoit asked whether Datatel is able to display a named minor and R. Jotcham confirmed that it is able to.

The Chair noted that President Ivany expected that Datatel, although much more difficult to customize, was also expected to provide much more flexibility “out of the box”.

D. Benoit asked whether the intention was to migrate to Datatel in the future.

The Chair believed this to be the intention, but one that could take three to five years to complete.

A. Quema pointed out that the inability to list a minor has been very problematic for the Women’s and Gender Studies program. A. Quema expressed frustration that it was not possible to tinker with the system. This was a human decision and that surely something could be done to display minors, in a much sooner than three to five year time frame. A. Quema requested that pressure be brought to bear on the issue.

The Chair responded that T. Herman would report back next month and was investigating the possibility of a manual solution. This would only involve the time it took to physically type in a minor for each graduating student. Although somewhat time-consuming, it would be much less time-consuming than reprogramming the system.

A. Quema noted that if Acadia wants to develop inter-disciplinary programs for students, this limitation had serious implications for programs such as Women’s and Gender Studies.

Nominating Committee: the Chair noted that the Constitution required her to hold a meeting once a year with the Nominating Committee and anyone else involved with the elections process. The Chair noted that this has only happened once in the past. Since this could be a large group, the Chair suggested doing a discussion by e-mail. There were no objections to this approach.

MPHEC discussion paper: The Chair drew attention to the MPHEC document called *Students at the Heart: Quality Assurance at Maritime Universities*

(Discussion Paper) & Regional Forum on Quality Assurance. The Chair noted that because Acadia has quality assurance procedures in place (the APRC and the Curriculum Committee) the VP Academic and President Ivany believe Acadia to be more advanced in these issues, compared to some other institutions. T. Herman is preparing a response on behalf of the institution which will be circulated to Senate in time for the February 11th meeting. The response is due to MPHEC by February 15th, 2013. The Chair suggested that once Senate had seen the institutional report, it may wish to endorse it, or else submit a separate report.

Budget Advisory Committee: the Chair reported that regular meeting dates have been set for this committee and that the chair of the committee was committed to providing the committee with materials well in advance of meetings. The Chair discussed the mandate of the committee, the membership structure and the budgetary process, and noted that information released at the Budget Advisory Committee meeting can be shared with Acadia constituents.

The Chair noted that the first draft of the 2013/14 budget was distributed showing significant cost overruns, but felt that this was not unusual and that additional cuts would be required in most areas over the next month. The Chair noted that at the next meeting discussion will include issues around position requests. D. Youden, P. Hobson, the Chair and R. Hare are all members of the committee and could receive input or answer questions.

b) From the President

President Ivany spoke briefly on the MOU process. President Ivany reminded Senate that he had expected that the province would delay the establishment of the new funding formula for another year, and that this has now been confirmed. The University will receive a 3% reduction in funding for 2013/14.

President Ivany stressed that the current model has had dire consequences for Acadia and that a change in the funding formula is of the greatest importance to Acadia. President Ivany also noted that the fact that there is less money in the pot overall, is an additional challenge. President Ivany noted that although the delay was frustrating at one level, it was preferable to implementation of another funding model that did not deal fairly with institutions like Acadia.

President Ivany referred to the *Annual Report from the President* and invited Senators to let him know by e-mail what sort of details would be useful for them to have included, so that the report could be most useful to Senators.

c) From the Vice-President Academic

T. Herman congratulated D. Seamone who was the recipient of a large research award with others. She was a member of a core international team of eight individuals working on a major international project on cultural and religious rituals, which was funded by the University of Oslo and included research from North America, Europe and South Africa.

T. Herman reminded Senate that the third round of the Harrison McCain awards was underway and that the adjudication would start one month earlier than in previous years. This was to provide additional time for successful applicants to make arrangements to use the award money, either by bringing in speakers, giving students employment, etc.

4) Brought forward from 10th
December, 2012

a) Proposed amendments to
Calendar Dates for 2013/14

The Chair recapped for those that were not at the previous Senate meeting. At the December meeting a motion from the TIE Committee to approve the proposed calendar dates for 2013/14 was moved and seconded. S. Major then requested a motion to amend the last day to submit Honours Theses for Spring Convocation from March 14th to April 7th, 2014 and to amend the deadline for approved Honours Theses for Spring Convocation from April 21st to May 1st, 2014 (moved by S. Major and seconded by M. Snyder).

The Chair reminded Senate that discussion of the amendment began but that a decision was taken to postpone further discussion so that ramifications of the amendment could be discussed with interested constituents. The Chair noted that A. Quema, D. MacKinnon and S. Major had already spoken once to the amendment and therefore only had one turn each left to speak.

M. Snyder stated that Biology faculty were in favour of the amendment, because their departmental deadline for a student to complete their Honours thesis was already much earlier than the March 14th date. However, M. Snyder would prefer the deadline not to be the final day of classes though.

The Chair stated that M. Snyder could amend the amendment if she wished to.

P. Williams stated that especially in the case of Psychology students, they normally had to submit their work to the Research Ethics Board, which made it even more challenging to meet the existing deadline. Perhaps it would be possible to work with the Research Ethics Board to try to expedite some of the fall applications. P. Williams also wondered whether it was necessary to have a 'one size fits all' model in place, since some departments were quite happy with the current dates.

B. Moody stated that in the Faculty of Arts he had received 14 replies, all of which rejected the amendment, and the idea of moving the deadline closer to the examination period. It was felt that this would seriously disadvantage the students and just push the thesis crisis into the exam crisis.

D. MacKinnon stated that he understand and sympathized with the Psychology and Biology students and noted that the need to have external readers tended to compound the problem.

C. Stanley stated that he had informally polled the Environmental Science students on this issue. He noted that students learn time management in university and felt that students should master the time management skills to finish the thesis on time. C. Stanley did not feel that pushing the deadline back presented any problem.

R. Worvill suggested that Schools and departments encourage students to start their thesis earlier; to consider Honours at the end of their second year, and to get started near the end of the third year. R. Worvill agreed that it would not be a help to run thesis deadlines into the examination review period.

D. Shea stated that she was a third year Business Honours student, and that during her third year she was taking the Honours Seminar which was a full credit. As a result she felt confident that she will complete her thesis on time.

H. Kitchin asked whether it would place a burden on Research and Graduate Studies if a two week window was implemented, so that those students that wanted to finish later could do so, while other students would submit on time.

D. MacKinnon responded that R&GS moves theses out to second readers as soon as they are received and that he anticipated that there would be difficulty finding readers during the examination period.

P. Hobson agreed with D. MacKinnon and stated that he would be voting against the amendment. P. Hobson felt that it would become difficult to get faculty to agree to serve as external readers during the examination period.

S. Major asked to amend the amendment.

Motion to amend the amendment which had stated *motion to amend the last day to submit Honours Thesis for Spring Convocation from March 14th to April 7th, 2014 and to amend the deadline for approved Honours Theses for Spring Convocation from April 21st to May 1st, 2014* to **motion to amend the last day to submit Honours Thesis for Spring Convocation to March 31st, 2014 and to amend the deadline for approved Honours Theses for Spring Convocation to April 21st, 2014. Moved by S. Major and seconded by H. Kitchin.**

D. Benoit asked whether this would mean that the second reader reviewed Honours Theses during the last week of classes and the two weeks of the exam period.

The Chair confirmed that this amendment would mean a shift into rather more of the exam period.

D. Benoit noted that as a lot of course work was due on the last day of classes, that there would be some likelihood that the external reader would read the thesis late and that it would be returned to the student late.

The Chair pointed out that Senate was voting on the amendment to the amendment at this point, and that after that they would return to vote on amendment itself.

D. MacKinnon noted that this amendment was better than the original one, but still created too much pressure during the exam period.

A. Quema asked whether Senate was discussing a campus wide change to deadlines, and suggested that if the deadlines were not consistent across departments, a student might complain if other departments were not requiring their students to follow the same deadlines.

The Chair felt that the concern was reasonable; however, units can and do already set earlier internal deadlines, so did not feel that this would be a major concern.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT CARRIED.

The Chair then asked Senators to vote on the amendment to make *the last day to submit Honours Thesis for Spring Convocation to March 31st, 2014 and to amend the deadline for approved Honours Theses for Spring Convocation to April 21st, 2014.*

AMENDMENT APPROVED.

The Chair now returned to the motion to approve the 2013/14 calendar dates, as amended.

MOTION CARRIED AS AMENDED.

b) Motion from Adam Foster, Graduate Student Representative (*attached*)

Motion that Senate approve the following amendment to the membership of the Research Ethics Board: One graduate student, who shall be appointed by the Acadia Graduate Student Association. In the event the 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. Moved by Adam Foster and seconded by Kyle Power.

A. Foster spoke to the motion and noted that there were currently discrepancies in documents as to whether the graduate student who was chosen to sit on the Research Ethics Board was to be selected by the AGSA or the SRC. A. Foster stated that the AGSA believed that whenever possible, the graduate students' representative should be selected by graduate students. A. Foster recognised, however, that the AGSA had not existed every year; hence the wording of the motion to allow the SRC to choose a graduate student representative if the AGSA did not exist in any given year.

MOTION CARRIED.

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

The Chair reminded Senator that the motion to approve the policy on Compassionate Leave came to the floor of Senate during the last meeting but was referred back to the committee for further consideration, as it previously included student fee changes that were not under the purview of Senate.

Motion that the proposed amended wording be approved by Senate. Moved by D. MacKinnon and seconded by W. Brackney.

D. MacKinnon noted that the wording of the original policy proposal erroneously included information of a financial nature. This had now been removed.

AMENDMENT TO THE WORDING CARRIED.

Senate now returned to the main motion to approve the policy on compassionate leave that was moved at the last Senate meeting.

R. Worvill noted that the wording was very specific and asked why.

D. MacKinnon stated that policies in other universities had been reviewed and that this policy would be consistent with those.

A. Quema questioned the wording "compassionate leave for a period of up to one year in the case of the death or serious illness of a family member" and asked how "ill" might be defined, and what would be included in "family" care. A. Quema felt that as the wording was so specific, a student could come back and say ask what was meant by 'ill', or by "family member".

D. MacKinnon responded that the committee does not have a definition for 'ill' and noted that it would fall within the purview of the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies to approve or not approve the leave request.

The Chair asked whether there was any mechanism for an appeal if a leave was denied.

D. MacKinnon responded that there was not.

MOTION CARRIED.

K. Power brought to the attention of Senate the fact that the 2013/14 Calendar dates showed Homecoming on the Thanksgiving weekend, and asked whether the motion could be reconsidered.

The Chair stated that a vote of two thirds of Senators would be needed to do so. The Chair noted that K. Power could ask why this decision was made, and if a satisfactory answer could be given, there would be no need to reconsider the motion.

R. Jotcham stated that the proposed calendar dates had been circulated to the Alumni Office and other departments for review, but received no feedback.

The Chair asked whether it would be a problem to have Homecoming on Thanksgiving weekend.

It was acknowledged that this was a problem.

Motion to reconsider moved by K. Power and seconded by M. Rios.

C. Stanley asked whether the sporting events are offered because of it being Homecoming week, or whether it is Homecoming week because sporting events are offered, and therefore define the Homecoming schedule.

President Ivany stated that all events are scheduled between the Office of Advancement and the Associated Alumni, and that it would be necessary to go back and see whether this was a conscious choice or an oversight.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER CARRIED.

Motion to postpone definitely consideration of the 2013/14 calendar dates to the February 2013 Senate meeting. Moved by K. Power and seconded by D. Benoit.

MOTION TO POSTPONE DEFINITELY CARRIED.

5) New Business

- a) Academic Program Review Committee – Prioritized Recommendations (*to be circulated*)

Motion that Senate approve the prioritized recommendations for the Jodrey School of Computer Science. Moved by T. Herman and seconded by J. Hennessy.

- i) Computer Science

T. Herman noted that Senate had received copies of the review of the Computer Science program, and the recommendations from the APRC, which arose from the review.

T. Herman worked through all nine recommendations included in the document. These were as follows:

- that the School develop a more integrated approach to Computer Science and the emerging discipline of Information and Communications Technology
- that a strategy be developed to address and alter the significant gender imbalance that existed amongst the students and the faculty
- that the School continue to increase collaboration with other academic units on campus
- that existing courses be modified or new ones created to incorporate significant coverage of human computer literacy
- that the School reconsider its approach to specialization degrees, since the School is currently constrained by its complement in its ability to deliver specializations
- that the School continue to make use of co-op placements to provide technical lab support in the School, but that it also work with the Dean and VPA to develop a funding model that would allow the position to be filled more predictably
- that maintaining accreditation, while desirable, created challenges within a unit as small as Computer Science. The APRC recommended that future staffing recognize the growing importance of ICT within the School
- that the School work with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics to develop a one-term combined differential and integral calculus course
- that the School consider integrating the Robot Programming Competition into both research and teaching. It was felt that this could also extend beyond the School to include collaborative efforts with other units on campus.

D. Benoit responded to the recommendations of the APRC.

D. Benoit noted that ICT (Information and Computer Technology) was believed by some to be what was taught in Community College, while others believed it to cover some of the software Computer Science courses with less math content. D. Benoit noted that faculty in the School of Computer Science were concerned that others might think that they were becoming a community college.

D. Benoit stated that attempts were being made to address the gender imbalance, but pointed out that hiring female faculty members was very difficult since they were in such demand and the salary offered at Acadia was not sufficient to attract them. Good female faculty tended also to leave for other positions.

D. Benoit pointed out that specializations were used as a marketing tool, and that although few students actually graduated with a specialization, the specializations that were advertised did bring students to the program.

D. Benoit stated that funding was needed for the lab instructor position. Co-op students were good but having a regular turnover every four, eight, or 12 months and therefore frequently having to re-train the lab instructor, was not an efficient use of resources.

D. Benoit acknowledged that the CIPS accreditation was hard to maintain but felt that without it the School would suffer. D. Benoit stated that although having accreditation may not be a draw in itself, it would speak volumes were the School not to have it.

H. Kitchin asked whether D. Benoit's response was available in a written form.

The Chair confirmed that it was not.

H. Kitchin asked whether the School should make a formal written response.

T. Herman agreed that there was no formal written response to the APRC recommendations.

H. Kitchin did not recall other programs responding to the APRC recommendations during Senate.

D. Benoit responded that he was just responding to the review.

The Chair affirmed that such a response was appropriate, and asked D. Benoit whether he had any other comments.

P. Hobson noted that he had been one of the internal reviewers of this program and that the CIPS reviewers were also the external reviewers. P. Hobson noted that they felt that if the faculty complement were to fall, CIPS accreditation would be in jeopardy. P. Hobson asked whether the University would therefore be prepared to allow the School to lose its accreditation, or could the accreditation process trump everything else.

T. Herman responded that all things being equal, CIPS accreditation should not be able to trump everything else. T. Herman stated that it was important to be mindful of disciplinary differences between programs and stated that loss of accreditation was not seen as an insurmountable problem in this instance. T. Herman noted that CIPS requires a rigid curriculum to be offered and that the School may be forced to offer that at the risk of faculty not being able to devote time to research and other teaching.

A. Quema addressed the difficulty in hiring women and noted that the gender imbalance has ramifications that spill also into student enrolment. A. Quema felt that the report recommendation captured the breadth of the problem well.

T. Herman was in agreement and noted that the imbalance in student demographics, recruitment material etc., was a serious issue with the APRC and was therefore placed high on the list of recommendations. T. Herman noted that this was a global problem.

J. Hennessy noted that there were several important Computer Science programs across Canada that were not presently accredited.

D. Benoit stated that the School was already acting to address the gender issue in their recruitment strategies. For example, the Robot Competition has required each team to have one female student on the team, and the Competition itself was started in part in order to get women into computer science. D. Benoit believed that the problem went back to the lack of Math courses taken by girls and the junior high school course selection. D. Benoit also noted that women who were good in Math also tended to have very good

communication skills, and that as a result, many other professions would be open to them to pursue.

D. Benoit noted that some of the large computer science schools that dropped their accreditation in the 90s have now gone back and applied again for accreditation. D. Benoit did not feel that CIPS accreditation forced the School to offer anything other than very useful courses.

P. Hobson noted the amount of work that had been undertaken by the review using a dataset that was already a year out of date. To make matters worse, the review was completed three years ago and was only now coming to Senate to vote on it. P. Hobson noted that there would be no way of knowing whether the data had altered since that time.

T. Herman responded that the APRC did meet in spring 2012 with the School Director, hence the update to the 2009 self-study report in April 2012, which had been distributed to Senate.

P. Hobson questioned the fact that the original reviewers had no part in the updated self-study and meeting with the School Director.

B. Anderson suggested that there were people on the campus that could help Computer Science with the gender issue.

D. Benoit noted that the School is actively trying to remedy the problem and was looking for active participation from all of the other units on campus.

W. Slights questioned the issues raised earlier around the timing of the self-study report and wondered whether there are situations where updates are required and whether these updates are provided to the original members of the review.

T. Herman agreed that the time lapse was unusual but that the academic unit was keen to have an updated self-study carried out, with interaction between Computer Science and the APRC. T. Herman confirmed that the APRC met with the unit and that the updated self-study document was not circulated to the original review members. T. Herman noted that the update had now been circulated to Senate.

MOTION APPROVED.

ii) School of
Recreation
Management and
Kinesiology
(*circulated*)

Motion that Senate approve the prioritized recommendations for the School of Recreation Management as circulated. Moved by T. Herman and seconded by S. Major.

T. Herman discussed the three general recommendations from the APRC to the School as a whole, and then went on to discuss recommendations that were specific to Kinesiology, and specific to Recreation Management and Community Development. T. Herman noted that since the time of the review in December 2010, the APRC had met with the School's Director, R. Murphy, and that during the intervening two year period, the School had implemented many changes to the programs.

- The APRC believed Kinesiology and Recreation Management & Community Development to be evolving on separate tracks and therefore encouraged the SRMK to consider its internal governance

structure

- The APRC encouraged the APC to consider the inter-disciplinary nature of the RMCD programs, and to direct the APC to consider structural reforms that might better support those programs
- The APRC recognized and appreciated the special demands on support staff as a result of the School's extensive community engagement and contributions to Varsity Athletics. SRMK was encouraged to explore available external funding sources if at all possible.

With respect to Kinesiology, the APRC noted the following:

- Increased enrolment created pressures for the program and the unit was encouraged to explore additional pedagogical and curriculum reform
- Lab space was inadequate and the issue should be referred to the University Space Allocation Committee. Also the Administration should target additional funding for equipment
- The unit was encouraged to continue to talk to other units on campus and to develop an interdisciplinary graduate program focused on Health and Wellness
- The APRC agreed with the present practice of a multi-day summer retreat, when reviewing curriculum issues
- The unit was encouraged to continue to work with the School of Nutrition to allow students from both programs to access both Kinesiology and Nutrition courses
- The breadth of the curriculum was supported and felt to be consistent with the CCUPEKA accreditation requirements
- The unit was encouraged to participate in tracking its graduates.

With respect to Recreation Management & Community Development the APRC noted the following:

- The unit is in a transitional state and as a result, on-going development of strategic focus is essential. Students progressing through programs in transition need to be supported
- The APC should explore the issue of support for, and structure of inter-disciplinary programs
- The unit should carefully monitor the effectiveness and accessibility of the international Core term trip
- As the MRM program lacks critical mass, the APRC encouraged the unit to explore opportunities for collaboration with other inter-disciplinary graduate programs on campus.
- The unit was asked to explore co-op options for RMCD programs.

A. Quema asked whether there was a response from the School Director.

R. Murphy stated that he had met with the VP Academic and relayed that discussion back to the School faculty and staff, who were pleased with the changes that had already been made. R. Murphy noted that the School was in a similar situation to Computer Science, in that they had already brought forward many changes to the programs as a result of the recommendations from the APRC.

J. Stanley asked for clarification around the focus on interdisciplinary nature of the programs and the opportunity to share resources.

T. Herman noted that especially in the case of the RMCD program, many areas lent themselves to inter-disciplinary study. The ESST program emerged from RMCD collaboration with other units on campus, and the area of health and wellness also had great potential for interdisciplinary collaboration. T. Herman noted that the APRC committee recognised that Acadia does not have the structures to allow the conversations to even take place in a rational way.

The Chair noted that the APRC did discuss the need to work out how inter-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary issues should work, and the belief was that there would be relevant information in the Women's and Gender Studies Self-Study response document, which should be coming to Senate next month.

H. Hemming noted that in the case of RMCD there was a need to share resources and that the curriculum changes were driven by some innovative programming.

A. Quema felt that there was a need to distinguish between saving money and the developing and enhancing of inter-disciplinary programs, so that inter-disciplinary programs not be seen merely as a vehicle by which to save money.

H. Kitchin asked whether some of the recommendations from the APRC regarding inter-disciplinary programs had been forwarded to the APC.

T. Herman responded that the APRC encouraged the APC to explore the issue of support for, and structure of inter-disciplinary programs. T. Herman noted that this would apply only if this recommendation received Senate approval.

H. Kitchin asked whether this was what the APC was struck to accomplish.

The Chair stated that the mandate of the APC was to consider academic planning issues and bring recommendations back to Senate. Improving inter-disciplinary structures on campus is certainly one area of academic planning that has been identified as needing improvement.

H. Kitchin was concerned that the APC, which was a non-representative committee, would turn into a committee that was making recommendations on inter-disciplinary issues. H. Kitchin asked whether this committee would be the most suitable one to make these sorts of recommendations.

The Chair stated that the issue of improved planning for interdisciplinary issues would be coming to Senate for consideration, after the APRC report on Women and Gender Studies was received, as it contained relevant information. At that point, Senate would decide which would be the most appropriate group to consider these issues. The APC is one option.

MOTION CARRIED.

6) New Business

7) Adjournment

It being 6:00 p.m. the Chair called for a motion to adjourn.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Attachment 4)a)
Senate Agenda 14th January, 2013

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)

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.

Attachment 4) c)
Senate Agenda 14 January 2013

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.

DRAFT

Academic Program Review Committee –

Recommendations arising from the Review of the Jodrey School of Computer Science

18 December 2012

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) met with the School's Director, Dr. Danny Silver on April 12, 2012 to discuss the unit's written response to the review and to update the APRC on relevant activities that had taken place in the School since the initial review. The Committee has formulated the following recommendations to Senate. These reflect the report of the review team, the School's response to that report, and the updates on activities in the School provided by its Director. Copies of the review, an update of the School's self-study and the School's response to the review, as well as the APRC's prioritized (from highest to lowest) recommendations below will be made available to Senate.

The APRC recognizes that significant time has lapsed since the initial review. The Committee commends the School for embracing the review process; it has both responded well to the review and kept the APRC informed as to updates and changes. The APRC recognizes that the School is actively pursuing solutions to its challenges.

Recommendations:

1. The discipline of Computer Science (CS) faces significant challenges, both in terms of public perception and disciplinary focus and direction. While there is increasing demand in society for individuals proficient in Information and Communications Technology (ICT), there is an underlying tension between the traditional discipline of computer science and the emerging discipline of ICT. Further, the discipline of CS is marginalized in the secondary school curriculum and, as a result, students are unaware of the nature of the discipline. As a result of a lack of both ICT focus and high school exposure, the enrolment in CS at Acadia has declined in recent years. The APRC urges the School to develop a more integrated approach to CS and ICT.
2. The APRC notes a significant gender imbalance in both student and faculty demographics and we urge the School to develop a strategy for improving this situation. Gender has to be a serious consideration, for instance, in student recruitment, faculty hiring, and curriculum. Female students should be consulted regarding recruitment materials and strategies. Gender has to be a serious consideration in any hiring, including part-time, full-time and any externally- funded research chairs. We urge the School to consult with female science faculty and female students throughout the process of curriculum development.
3. We commend the efforts and achievements of the School to increase collaboration with other academic units on campus and recommend that the School further develop ways to share expertise, both through academic programs and research collaboration. The creation of the new Business Technology Management major within the BBA is a good example of the positive results of relationship building efforts.
4. The present curriculum contains relatively few courses dealing with human-computer interactions. Recognizing the central importance of digital literacy for all students, we urge the School to modify existing courses or create new courses that incorporate significant coverage of human-computer interactions. This would address several issues: a) diversity of the student base, including gender imbalance, among majors in

computer science; and b) provide opportunities for the development of double majors, as well as Arts and Science minors.

5. Although the past practice within the School in response to the rapidly evolving nature of the discipline has been to create specialization degrees, the APRC urges the School to reconsider this approach. The School is constrained by its current complement to deliver specializations, presenting significant challenges regarding the effective use of limited faculty resources and, hence, the ability of students to fulfill program requirements. In recognition of the dynamic nature of the discipline of Computer Science, the inflexibility of maintaining an array of specialization degrees hampers program delivery and the responsiveness of the Unit to the changing nature of the discipline. There are ample opportunities for specialization to occur (e.g., through co-op placements). With fewer specialization degrees, the School would be in a better position to protect its fundamental core while at the same time expanding its course offerings in ICT.

6. The School has been challenged with the phase-out of the common computing platform that came with the AA initiative. Prior to that, the School maintained a common environment with their own computer labs. Ensuring that software is cross-platform compatible and can be installed on a variety of machines is a task that has fallen to the CS faculty. They currently have part-time funding for co-op students but typically it does not last for the full-year and they have to seek support from the RPC or research funds to maintain the technician year round. The School has worked very hard to obtain top-up funding through co-op programs funded by the government. The APRC recommends that the School: a) continue to pursue co-op funding; b) continue to collaborate with the RPC to fund the position; and c) work with the Dean and the VP-Academic to develop a funding model that will ensure that the position be filled year-round should co-op funding applications be unsuccessful.

7. Maintaining accreditation is a challenge within a small unit; however it is more important to create reasonable and rational course loads for faculty so that faculty can maintain appropriate amounts of time for research and supervision of research students. Any

future staffing must recognize the growing importance of ICT within a School of Computer Science. The APRC recognizes that accreditation may be at risk but remains unconvinced that accreditation is essential to attract or retain students.

8. The Committee recognizes the School's desire to retain Math courses in calculus, statistics, discrete math and linear algebra but recommends that the School work with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics to develop a one-term combined differential and integral calculus course.

9. The School has expanded the Robot Programming Competition (RPC) as outlined in the review. The APRC recognizes that the costs of this programme are high and is pleased to see that the School has secured substantial external funding. The RPC is an important tool for community engagement, awareness and interest in computer science and recruitment. In recognition of the Unit's strengths in artificial intelligence, mobile computing, and game and software development, the APRC urges the School to integrate RPC competitions into research and teaching. This integration could extend beyond the School to include collaborative efforts with other units on campus (e.g., School of Education, School of Business, Mathematics and Statistics, Psychology).

Academic Program Review Committee –

Recommendations arising from the Review of the School of Recreation Management and Kinesiology

December 4, 2012

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) met with the School's Director, Dr. Rene Murphy on March 22, 2012 to discuss the unit's written response to the review and to update the APRC on relevant activities that had taken place in the School in the interim. The Committee has formulated the following recommendations to Senate. These reflect the report of the review team, the School's response to that report, and the updates on activities in the School provided by its Director. A copy of the review and the School's response, as well as the APRC's prioritized (from highest to lowest) recommendations below will be made available to Senate.

General Recommendations

1. It is apparent to the APRC that programs in the two units, Kinesiology and Recreation Management & Community Development (RMCD) are evolving on separate tracks. In light of this evolution, we encourage SRMK to consider its internal governance structure.
2. The APRC also encourages the Academic Planning Committee to consider the inter-disciplinary nature of the RMCD programs in particular, and to explore structural reforms that might better support those programs.
3. The APRC recognizes that the workload is challenging for the present support staff complement. Although these challenges are not unique to the School, the Committee appreciates the special demands on support staff as a result of the School's extensive community engagement as well as its contributions to Varsity Athletics. We encourage SRMK to monitor those external commitments and explore available external funding sources if additional resources are required.

Recommendations Specific to Kinesiology

The APRC notes that the Kinesiology Unit has already conducted a strategic curriculum planning review as recommended in the Unit Review. We applaud the efforts of the unit to address a number of the issues raised in the program review and offer comments on the following:

1. The Committee recognizes the pressures that the Unit has faced as a result of its enrolment increase in the past two years. In order to continue to provide a personalized approach for students in the program, we encourage the Unit to explore additional pedagogical and curriculum reform.
2. The Committee notes the inadequate size of the Kinesiology laboratories. This issue should be referred to the University Space Allocation Committee. The APRC recognizes the need for research space and equipment. Despite recent success in securing external funding to upgrade space and provide equipment, the Committee encourages the Administration to target additional funding for equipment.
3. The APRC encourages the Kinesiology Unit to continue developing and promoting an interdisciplinary graduate program focused on Health and Wellness and, as one option, consider the "four-plus-one" model described in the Review. Furthermore, it encourages the Unit to consult other interested units on the development of such a program.

4. The APRC concurs with the Unit that rather than establishing a standing committee to review curriculum issues on a regular basis as suggested in the Unit Review, the present practice of revisiting curriculum issues in a multi-day retreat in the summer months should be continued.
5. The APRC supports the Unit's decision to not require a Nutrition course for its students, but encourages the Unit to continue discussions with the School of Nutrition regarding timetabling and pre-requisites to allow students from both units access to each other's courses.
6. The APRC supports the Unit's defense of the breadth of its curriculum; this is both consistent with the underlying philosophy of the Unit and meets the accreditation requirements of CCUPEKA.
7. The tracking of graduates should be a concern for the Kinesiology Unit, as it should be for all units at the University. The APRC encourages the Unit to participate in the tracking process.

Recommendations Specific to Recreation Management and Community Development (RMCD)

The APRC recognizes that the RMCD Unit is in a state of significant transition. The faculty members of the Unit are highly involved and engaged with the evolution of the Unit's programs.

1. Due to the Unit's transitional state, the APRC recognizes that the on-going development of strategic focus is essential. The Committee applauds the Unit's efforts to engage in significant planning exercises with both internal and external constituents. As a result the Unit has submitted substantial curriculum proposals. We encourage the Unit to continue to support and manage students as they progress through programs in transition. We recommend that the Unit continue to develop messaging and promotional materials in collaboration with Enrolment Management and that as the programs evolve, the Unit ensure the information about course offerings is consistent and current. The attempt in the Strategic Planning to focus the curriculum to allow more depth should also permit more efficient use of limited resources and improve retention of students. More focused programming may also provide an opportunity to re-invigorate the Honours program.
2. The Committee recognizes the constraints on faculty complement within which the programs operate, particularly in the current context in which faculty are delivering three separate programming streams. There is concern that this situation is not sustainable and we recommend in the short term that additional teaching resources be provided, and in the longer term, that the Academic Planning Committee explore the issue of support for, and structure of inter-disciplinary programs.
3. The APRC applauds the Unit's efforts to plan comprehensively for the Core term. The Committee recognizes that this is a strong recruiting tool and is a high priority for both students and faculty. The Committee recommends that the Unit monitor the effectiveness and accessibility of the International core term trip.
4. There is tremendous potential for Honours and other undergraduate research opportunities within the unit, particularly given the new strategic focus. While the Unit supports the continuation of the MRM program, the APRC is concerned that such a small program lacks critical mass. The Committee encourages the Unit to explore opportunities for collaboration with other inter-disciplinary graduate programs on campus.
5. The Committee acknowledges the relevance of the co-op option for RMCD programs and encourages the Unit to explore these further, particularly when the transition to the new curricula is complete.