



A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 19 November 2012 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 40 present.

1) Approval of Agenda

Before the motion to approve the agenda was moved, the Chair drew attention to one possible addition, which had been circulated by e-mail. This was a request from the VPA regarding admissions requirements for Psychology majors. The Chair asked that it be added to the agenda as item 5) a) with the remaining items renumbered accordingly, and noted that this required a majority of all Senators to be willing to waive the required Notice of Motion, as this was not circulated 7 days before the meeting.

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

Motion to approve the agenda as revised. Moved by J. Banks, seconded by B. Moody.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

2) Minutes of the Meeting of
9 October 2012

Motion to approve the Minutes of Tuesday 9th October as distributed. Moved by B. Hagerman, seconded by A. Smith.

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

J. Hennessy drew attention to item 7) c) *Budget of the Academic Sector – Acadia's Academic Priorities*, the final paragraph and noted that he had been asking for further detail regarding the *non-salary sums in the Deans' budgets*, and not the *non-salary sum shown as 'miscellaneous' in the VPA's budget*.

The Chair asked if there were any objections to this amendment. There were none.

Amendment to the Minutes of Tuesday 9th October, 2012: the words *non-salary sum shown as 'miscellaneous' in the VPA's budget* will be struck and replaced with *non-salary amounts in the Deans' budgets*.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES CARRIED.

3) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

Regrets were received from L. Aylward, I. Hutchinson, R. Ivany, J. Guiney Yallop, K. Power, B. Leslie, E. Cochrane, and M. Rios.

The Chair welcomed Adam Foster, the new AGSA President and Graduate Student representative on Senate, and Darcy Shea, the new Student Senator from the Faculty of Professional Studies.

The Chair also welcomed S. Hewitt (replacing R. Proulx); R. Seale (replacing S. Henderson, who had been covering for D. Seamone during her leave); S. Henderson, who was taking over G. Poulter's Senate position; and J. MacDonald (covering for P. Hobson while on Sabbatical until December 31st, 2012).

The Chair also introduced and welcomed Rosie Hare, Administrative Assistant to the Dean of the Faculty of Professional Studies and Executive Assistant to the VP Finance and Administration; and noted that she would be taking the minutes on this occasion.

The Chair now provided updates on four meetings that she has attended or will be attending in her role as Chair of Senate. These were as follows:

- The By-Laws Committee: The Chair noted that this meeting was requested by the By-Laws Committee and that the purpose was to discuss the review of Senate Committees. Feedback and suggestions received during the last year or so, regarding Senate committees, their organization, problems and/or possible improvements, have now been passed on to the By-Laws committee. Senators were encouraged to contact the committee formally or informally if they felt the need to provide additional feedback or input. The Chair noted that the Chair of this committee is H. Kitchin, and that the other members are B. Anderson, W. Brackney and J. MacLeod.
- The Academic Planning Committee: The Chair noted that this meeting was at her own request. The Chair reminded Senators that at the September meeting of Senate they had discussed a possible approach to coordinating academic and financial planning; one of having the Academic Planning Committee (Senate committee) working together with the Academic Resources Committee (Board committee), and that together they could come up with plans that were academically and financially sound, with the intention that joint recommendations could go forward to both governing bodies. The Chair met with P. Jewer, the Chair of the Board of Governors during the summer and it was felt that the Board also considered this collaboration to be reasonable and workable.

The Chair reported that at her meeting with the Academic Planning Committee a different message was conveyed. The APC noted that the Board approves a budget that has already been determined by the Senior Administration. The Committee pointed out that recommendations to be made to Senate needed to be financially sound and that the detailed financial information necessary to form the basis for these recommendations could only come from Mary MacVicar's office. It was felt that the VPA and the Deans have access to the information that they need when it comes to setting priorities within the academic budget envelope. It was also felt that advocating for the academic sector when overall budget priorities were being set was the job of the VPA. Finally, the committee noted that the Board of Governors would be kept informed and up to date on the progress of a number of committees whenever the VPA reported to the Board

meeting.

- Future meeting with Paul Jewer and President Ivany: The Chair reported that she will be meeting with P. Jewer and R. Ivany on 7th December, 2012, and noted that she is open to feedback and comments from Senate, or individual input from any Senator any time before the December 7th meeting.

The Chair stated that at this meeting, there is a need to consider whether the focus should be a) on the most efficient mechanism for ensuring that financial and academic planning work together at this time; or b) ensuring that transparent mechanisms are in place to ensure that the status quo continues into the future, even if other circumstances have altered.

The Chair noted that the current composition of the APC was such that she could count on the various individuals to take both financial and academic considerations into account when engaging in planning. She would also like to feel that the current senior administrators could be relied upon to be strong advocates for the academic sector, and that they would prioritize the needs of the academic sector when they were engaged in planning and budgeting.

On a final point, the Chair felt that the senior administration could be counted on at present to be an effective conduit to translate balanced information back and forth between the Senate and the Board. The Chair noted however, that this has not always been the case, and that if in the future different people were to fill key administrative roles, there would be no guarantee that this would continue to be the case.

The Chair felt that it would be worth setting up a system of checks and balances at this time, to ensure that open communication could continue even if less than ideal circumstances arose.

- The Chair reported that she would be meeting shortly with the Budget Advisory Committee in her capacity as Chair of Senate. She noted that this committee does not report to either Senate or the Board, but was formed by R. Ivany and had representation from all sectors and employee groups. The Chair noted that this committee receives drafts of the proposed budget and information regarding the actual budget figures, but that beyond that she remains unclear as to the role of the committee. The Chair will be asking this question at the Budget Advisory Committee meeting and invited Senators to come forward with suggestions and questions that they would like her to ask.

Senators were asked if they had any questions or comments.

A. Quema noted that since a link between the APC and the ARC might not be the best way, would it make sense for the Academic Planning Committee and the Budget Advisory Committee to work together.

The Chair felt that this might be a good idea, as the Budget Advisory Committee has broad representation and includes those with access to detailed budget information; however, the committee is large and might be unwieldy; also, the Budget Advisory Committee does not report to any governing body, which might be a concern.

A. Quema requested that this proposal be put to the APC to see what they thought of it.

b) From the Vice-President Academic

T. Herman acknowledged all of the faculty members and students that were involved in the Industry and Community Partnership Day that was held last Friday, and thanked in particular D. MacKinnon for his work with the event. T. Herman noted that it was a very successful day and that the panel discussions were productive and diverse.

4) Brought forward from 9 October 2012

a) Motions re: Discrepancies in Senate Membership (attached)

The Chair reminded Senators that there were four different membership lists for Senate, none of which matched each other. The Chair and B. Anderson had previously circulated a report that outlined discrepancies and provided recommendations for how to deal with them. The Chair noted that there was now specific wording and changes in the Senate Constitution and By-Laws to resolve the discrepancies. The Chair recognized that some of these changes could 'alter the composition of Senate' and that therefore a 2/3 majority vote on the motions would be needed. This could be done by a show of hands if necessary.

Prior to the motion being moved, B. Anderson requested a correction to the *VP Finance and Administration, and CFO* title.

There were no objections.

Motion that the following changes be made to Article II of the Senate Constitution (Membership of Senate). Moved by B. Anderson, seconded by H. Kitchin.

B. Anderson commented that the intention was to clean up the membership list, but not to make substantive changes.

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion that the changes to Appendix A of the Senate Constitution be approved as circulated. Moved by B. Anderson, seconded by D. MacKinnon.

There were no objections to the correction to the *VP Finance and Administration, and CFO* title.

A. Quema asked how many members of Senate there are now.

B. Anderson stated that Appendix A is the original Board information/text, plus all of the changes incorporated over the years, and that the number of Senate positions is currently 57 (the number of Senators may be less, as one Senator might hold multiple positions. Currently, there are 55 Senators).

H. Kitchin asked whether quorum will need to be changed and the Chair confirmed that there would be no change to quorum.

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion that the following changes be made to Article III, Section 4, of the Senate Constitution (Terms and Duties of Membership). Moved by B. Anderson and seconded by B. Brackney.

B. Anderson explained that this change to Section III, Section 4, provides clarity around the appointment of students that sit on Senate, especially as relates to the Divinity students, as there was previously no stated mechanism for appointing them.

A. Quema asked why the appointment of the Divinity students was being proposed as it was.

H. Gardiner explained that the makeup of the incoming divinity class will vary and that the Divinity College Student Association is often not fully formed until later in the year. In years when the Student Association is active and functioning in the fall, they will select a representative. However, the option of having the Dean of Theology appoint a Divinity College student in years when the Student Association is not functioning, or is not formed until late in the year, allows for student appointments to be made in a timely manner for Senate.

The Chair noted that similar issues have arisen in the past; for example, the Graduate Students' Association had not formed one year, with the result that no graduate student served on Senate that year.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Chair noted that these motions will go to the Board of Governors for ratification and that she would discuss the changes with P. Jewer when they meet in December. The Chair noted that any change that 'alters the composition of Senate or the term of office of any of its members' would also need to be approved by two thirds of the Board.

b) Budget of the Academic Sector – Acadia's Academic Priorities (circulated previously)

The Chair noted that this document had been circulated at the previous meeting, in response to a question and a motion several years ago requesting that information regarding the proposed budget be provided to Senate at the start of the academic year, and that information regarding the actual budget be provided at the end of the academic year.

T. Herman discussed the document and provided additional breakdowns. The Deans were asked to add their comments if they felt the need. T. Herman noted that there is a history attached to each Faculty envelope and that Senators should not expect the categories in the three to look exactly the same. The total non-salary budgeted figures for each Dean were as follows:

Arts	\$69,700
Pure and Applied Science	\$63,600
Professional Studies	\$60,900

T. Herman explained that additional TA money had been added to all three Faculties in 2012-13 as this had been identified as a pressing need. T. Herman also noted that the Coop program salaries and non-salary operating expenses were housed within Pure and Applied Science and Professional Studies.

A. Quema asked for clarification about the words 'Dean's Reconciliation' and T. Herman noted that this was merely an accounting term.

A. Smith asked who the TAs in the Library budget would be, and S. Lochhead responded that these were student assistants.

P. Doerr asked what the P/T 25.54 covered. T. Herman explained that this was professional development funding that was allocated to P/T faculty. T. Herman noted that the only way to calculate the total amount of P/T 25.54 monies, was to use hiring data from the previous year. Since part-time hiring could vary greatly from year to year, this was a far from perfect process.

J. Hennessy responded that the report was far more detailed and useful than had been provided in the past. T. Herman was thanked for providing the report.

J. Hennessy noted that when he looked at the report, he saw more budgeted than his unit actually received; perhaps because 25.54 monies were included. J. Hennessy asked if the 25.54 totals could be separated out of the budget in order to get a truer picture of discretionary budget in each unit. T. Herman thanked J. Hennessy for the suggestion and agreed to provide that breakdown in future.

P. Williams pointed out that the 'Emergency Funding' of \$20,000 for each Faculty, was only available if needed; in the case of a faculty member taking sick leave or something similar.

D. Holmberg noted that the next budget details will come to Senate in the spring, and that these will be actuals for 2012-13.

5) New Business

- a) Motion from the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (Policy)

Motion that the program admission requirements for the Psychology program be amended with the following common requirement for both Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Psychology majors: Grade 11 Academic or Advanced Math, with Grade 12 Academic or Advanced Math recommended. Moved by T. Herman and seconded by S. Major.

T. Herman stated that it had been recommended in the past that Senate update and streamline the admission requirements for various programs. T. Herman noted that the requested changes to the admission requirements for Psychology were brought forward at that time, but that they somehow 'fell through the cracks'. T. Herman stated that this change would bring Acadia's admission requirements for Psychology into line with other institutions. T. Herman read statements from P. McLeod noting that students frequently switch between the BA Psyc and the BSc Psyc, and that their high school marks are very rarely referred back to at that point in time.

S. Major stated that the Grade 11 Math requirement would be the one needed for both the BA Psyc and the B.Sc Psyc, as both have identical statistics requirements within the program.

MOTION CARRIED.

- b) Senate Committee Annual Reports (*attached*)

i) By-Laws Committee

Motion that Senate receive the annual report from the By-Laws Committee. Moved by H. Kitchin and seconded by J. Best.

H. Kitchin stated that the By-Laws Committee will be meeting on December 4th and that the committee is obligated to have an initial report regarding potential changes to Senate committee structures presented to Senate in January 2013.

MOTION CARRIED.

c) Report from the Academic Planning Committee
(attached)

The Chair asked T. Herman to speak to the report. T. Herman noted that the Academic Planning Committee (APC) was formed at the end of the last academic year, as the work of the APPC concluded; and that the committee had already met on two occasions. T. Herman noted that the committee recognized that it was critical that it make tangible recommendations to Senate, and that its mandate was “to make recommendations to Senate on matters relating to academic principles and planning. In carrying out its work, the APC shall consult widely with all stakeholders and relevant bodies on campus. The APC shall report regularly to Senate, no less than two times a year”.

T. Herman expected that the APC will report more than twice a year to Senate. He also expected that the committee would be consultative and transparent. He felt that the fact that the committee was small would be useful because the committee members could discuss matters of substance and still make some progress. The committee had identified key areas for further discussion:

- Revisiting and restatement of Acadia’s key values, and mechanisms for incorporating those values into planning
- Identification of Acadia’s optimal capacity
- Exploration of “end states” for enrolment, including quotas
- Ensuring the sustainability of small programs
- Ensuring integrity of large programs
- Assessing existing unit structures

T. Herman reported that at the October meeting the committee discussed the “Proposed Academic Planning Committee Planning Framework” document that had been prepared by T. Weatherbee.

In the second meeting, it was acknowledged that there was already a lot of data collected from the APPC. T. Herman noted that the APPC generated an enormous amount of data from the wider community. That information has been transferred to the new committee. T. Herman also noted that the committee had begun to tackle the Strategic Plan ‘as an element that could be incorporated into the Academic Planning Process.’ T. Herman highlighted the fact that the APPC collected responses from academic units on campus, and that these responses illustrate how the units see their programs within the Strategic Plan mission statement, especially with regards to the provision of a sustainable liberal-based education.

T. Herman stated that the committee had begun to tackle the values and missions section of the Strategic Plan and then looked at the Acadia Education section, zeroing in on the items that are explicit components of the educational experience at Acadia:

- Personalized attention to students as learners
- Undergraduate research
- Education of the whole student
- A focus on the environment and important social issues
- Emphasis on responsible global citizenship

It was felt that 'Community Engagement' was a sixth area that could be added, since in recent years this has become central to the institution's activities.

T. Herman noted that the next meeting will move into a discussion of inter-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary areas.

The Chair asked whether other members of the APC wished to offer any further comments. There were none.

W. Slights questioned the statement 'recognizing that issues of resource allocation and planning are occasionally confused or conflated' which occurred in the final paragraph of page nine of the Interim Report of the Senate Planning Committee. W. Slights asked whether it was a good thing or a bad thing to link current constraints to resource allocation.

T. Herman responded that it was impossible to talk about sustainable academic programs unless they can be maintained in a sustainable financial framework. T. Herman did not see that the committee would be creating budgets, but there was a need to be aware of what the budgetary constraints were, and what areas should be prioritized when making arguments for budgets. T. Herman noted that temporary financial realities could manifest themselves in ways that could be misinterpreted as re-prioritising. T. Herman gave the example of a burst pipe, which might be a reality that had not been budgeted for. It would result in a change in the actual budget, but that should not necessarily be assumed to reflect a change in the planned budgetary priorities.

H. Kitchin stated that when she was on the APPC and the survey was issued, a primary concern from units was that the funding that was required to plan for hiring was not relayed to the units until too late. H. Kitchin asked what was being done with that information, and whether the APC might be able to work on aligning various budgetary and planning schedules better in the future. H. Kitchin also asked what 'plan for the planning' meant.

T. Herman noted that 'plan for the planning' meant designing a planning structure that worked effectively. This would be to design something that linked actions up in the correct sequence, with the correct information available at the right time. For example, if timelines did not line up, problems and mismatches could be identified and corrected. Several were identified last year, and attempts are being made to improve the sequence in future. However, some of those timelines were mandated in the 13th Collective Agreement, and would therefore involve discussions with the AUFA Joint Committee or negotiations before they could be changed.

H. Kitchin asked whether it was likely that such adjustments to timelines will happen.

T. Herman stated that it was likely, because of the urgency to change some of these timelines.

H. Kitchin asked again for clarification about the differentiation between 'planning' and 'plan for planning'.

The Chair stated she felt that it was coming up with a larger plan for when and how the lower-level yearly planning was going to be done. T. Herman concurred.

A. Quema read parts of the last paragraph on page ten of the document and noted the extensive use of confusing jargon which resulted in obscure text. A. Quema reminded T. Herman that one of the mandates of the committee was to be 'transparent'.

T. Herman thanked A. Quema and stated that he was in agreement and promised to request that the committee clarify its language around this issue.

W. Slights asked what an 'end state' was and T. Herman noted that this is language from the strategic planning community and noted that a member of the committee has expertise in that area. T. Herman offered to invite T. Weatherbee to attend Senate and provide a brief explanation of the terminology for the benefit of the Senators. The Chair asked for a show of hands as to who would like T. Weatherbee to attend Senate for this purpose. Less than half of the Senate members felt it was necessary.

A. Quema recommended that the committee avoid jargon, and noted that this language sounded very administrative in the wrong sense of the word because it sounded very top down. A. Quema reminded T. Herman that the committee was supposed to be representative and work together.

H. Kitchin noted as a point of clarification that the committee is not a representative committee.

- d) Motion from the Senate Curriculum Committee to approve curriculum changes proposed by the School of Computer Science (*attached*)

Motion from the Senate Curriculum Committee to approve curriculum changes proposed by the School of Computer Science. Moved by A. Quema and seconded by D. Benoit.

A. Quema apologised for this motion only coming to Senate now but noted that it was May before the proposal came to the Curriculum Committee and that it became impossible to get the committee together over the summer. A. Quema also noted that it took time in September/October to get the Curriculum Committee properly constituted; hence the delay.

D. Benoit thanked A. Quema for moving this issue forward and noted that there had been a mistake made at the FPAS Faculty Council which delayed the change coming forward to Curriculum Committee.

D. Benoit noted that three changes were requested. Comp 3403 and 3703 would no longer be required courses for the Specializations. A new Software Development program would replace the E-Commerce program. Lastly, two Psychology courses would be removed from the *Mobile and Ubiquitous Computing* Specialization, and Comp 4343 would be added as a required course.

S. Major asked about the removal of the two Psychology courses.

D. Benoit stated that it had been realised that the students will learn more relevant information by taking the Human Computer Interaction course which

is now taught.

S. Major asked about the Psychology Research Methods course.

D. Benoit noted that the Human Computer Interaction course provides what the students will need.

A. Quema commented that this discussion demonstrated the way in which a modification to a program may affect another program, so that departments should be encouraged to discuss proposed changes with one another.

D. Benoit noted that his predecessor would have discussed this with the Head of the Psychology Department.

P. Williams confirmed that this did happen.

MOTION CARRIED.

e) Motions from the Senate Chair regarding possible changes to Senate Procedures (*attached*)

The Chair stated that she had received a number of suggestions for possible changes to Senate procedures and that rather than make any unilateral decisions, she had decided to bring the suggestions forward as motions to be debated and decided upon at Senate. She noted that she was not advocating voting for or against the motions; they are simply a mechanism to gauge Senate opinion, and she was happy to follow the will of Senate either way.

D. Holmberg now relinquished the Chair and asked P. Doerr to assume the role.

P. Doerr took over as Chair and noted what a delight it was to be back.

Motion #1

Motion that the Chair shall enforce the following rule in the Senate Constitution (Part III, point 5): “If any elected or appointed member of Senate, other than ex-officio members, misses three consecutive regular meetings, that member’s seat shall be declared vacant and shall be filled by recourse to the appropriate electoral or appointment procedure”. To give fair warning, counts of absences shall begin at the November meeting. Moved by D. Holmberg and seconded by A. Smith.

D. Holmberg noted that a signature sheet is completed to monitor attendance, but that the rule has not been enforced in recent memory. The rule only applied to elected Senators and not to ex-officio members of Senate. D. Holmberg noted that had the rule been enforced last year or this year, there would have been Senators that would have had to be replaced.

V. Zamlyny asked if a Senator sent regrets, would the absence still be counted?

D. Holmberg responded that if a Senator consistently can’t attend, they should be replaced. If for example, a Senator taught class at the same time as Senate, they should presumably be replaced even if they sent regrets each month, to allow their constituents proper representation.

B. Anderson noted that it was unusual to have a motion to rule on something that is already part of the Senate Constitution. B. Anderson felt that the ruling could be modified to make exceptions to the rule if extenuating circumstances

applied, or that the ruling should be got rid of altogether.

D. Holmberg agreed that if Senate preferred not to enforce this rule, that it should be removed from the Constitution.

J. Banks asked whether Senators who could not attend, could send an alternate.

D. Holmberg responded that a Senator could ask for someone to attend as their guest, but there was no mechanism for individuals to send someone else as a voting alternate or proxy.

H. Kitchin provided clarification that Senate was not talking about Senators that were on Sabbatical or on a prolonged sick leave who are replaced by an open election process, but explicitly about Senators that just don't come to the meetings.

A. Quema was not in favour of policing people. However, she recognized that Senators have been elected to represent their community and debate serious matters, and they need representation. A. Quema felt that the rule was already pretty generous and wondered why people would be on Senate in the first place if they did not intend to attend.

D. Benoit asked how this would work for Directors like himself that are placed on Senate by their School, but are not elected.

D. Holmberg pointed out that D. Benoit and other Directors are ex-officio members of Senate and can therefore could in theory stop attending or attend infrequently, but still remain on Senate. D. Holmberg will update the list of Senate membership to indicate the Directors who are members ex-officio.

J. Whidden did not like the idea that this motion suggested by implication that members were not responsible enough to attend Senate, and would still allow their name to stand as a member.

A. Smith noted that Senators need to represent their constituents, and that it was recognized that there were Senators that were not attending.

J. MacLeod asked, for clarification, if this was a motion to enforce a rule that was already included in the Constitution.

D. Holmberg agreed that this motion would simply provide a direction to the Chair to enforce an already-existing rule in the Constitution that Senators who missed three consecutive meetings should be replaced. D. Holmberg clarified again that if it was not the wish of Senate to enforce the existing rule, then the rule should be removed from the Constitution for the sake of consistency.

R. Jotcham was asked what happens to the signature sheet and R. Jotcham stated that it is retained with the minutes of the meeting.

D. Holmberg would be able to check from the signature sheets which Senators were consistently absent.

R. Jotcham pointed out that regardless of the outcome of the vote, it was important for everyone in the meeting to sign the signature sheet.

MOTION #1 CARRIED.

Motion #2

Motion that the Chair shall enforce a standing special order to limit announcements to five minutes per speaker (including time for questions). Moved by D. Holmberg and seconded by P. Williams.

D. Holmberg spoke to the motion, noting that announcements had been running long and some had suggested a time limit to allow more time for items on the agenda. D. Holmberg stated that if a person making announcements knew that they would need extra time, they could ask the Chair in advance to note it on the agenda, or they (or anyone else) could make a motion to amend the agenda or extend the debate at the meeting; otherwise, five minutes would be allowed as the default.

J. Hennessy asked what should be done if the announcements from the Chair approach the five minute mark?

D. Holmberg recognized that this can happen but stated that she would generally know in advance if she would need additional time, and would have it approved as part of the agenda. D. Holmberg's hope was that she would be sufficiently self-disciplined to conclude her remarks before the five minute point was up, but that if she wasn't, she would be open to feedback from Senate.

H. Kitchin did not feel that she could support this motion because a more open time frame gave Senators an opportunity to ask questions of the administrators, and limiting those discussions to five minutes would define the parameters of questions that could be asked and would be limiting. H. Kitchin asked if there were other questions to be asked of the administration would Senators need to ask for them to be added to the agenda.

D. Holmberg said that any Senator is welcome to add any item to the agenda, so that if a Senator knew that they had questions for discussion, they could request that they be added to the agenda.

H. Kitchin asked whether the addition would be under 'Other'?

D. Holmberg said this would be under 'New Business'.

S. Henderson felt that this motion was unnecessary and pointed out that announcements can often contain 'bombshells'. He felt that if the discussion was moving swiftly it would be awkward to stop to take a vote to extend the debate.

An amendment to the motion asking that the words '*limit announcements to five minutes per speaker*' be replaced with '*limit announcements to ten minutes per speaker*' was moved by S. Major and seconded by V. Zamlyny.

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

MOTION #2 CARRIED AS AMENDED.

Motion #3

Motion that the Chair shall rule questions that are not germane to the topic(s) of a speaker's announcements as being out of order. Moved by D. Holmberg and seconded by J. Holt.

D. Holmberg noted the fact that Robert's Rules of Order specify that statements must be germane to the motion that has been made; however, she has not been enforcing such a rule during announcements, allowing any questions to be posed. D. Holmberg stated that if this motion were to pass, then if issues or questions are brought up that are unrelated to the announcements made, the Chair would rule them out of order. D. Holmberg made it clear that these were suggestions that had been made by other Senators and not by those who make the announcements. D. Holmberg noted that if a question were ruled not germane, a Senator could still discuss it by adding it to the agenda; however, note that after the agenda had been approved, the request to amend the agenda would require a 2/3rds majority approval vote.

W. slights asked whether a Senator may challenge the 'out of order' ruling from the Chair.

D. Holmberg responded that a Senator certainly can challenge the ruling (and any ruling by the Chair), and that a discussion would be held before putting the challenge to a vote.

A. Quema asked whether any Senator was allowed to make an announcement.

D. Holmberg responded that it was allowable. The standing individuals to make announcements are the Chair, the President and the VP Academic. D. Holmberg noted that if any Senator contacted her ahead of time they would be added to the list of those making announcements at a given meeting. Also, when the Chair asks if there are any other announcements at the end of the announcement session, any Senator is welcome to make one at that time.

H. Kitchin felt that this was a very prescriptive approach, and felt that there are certain questions that need to be asked at certain times.

D. Holmberg responded that if that was the feeling of Senate, then she would suggest that H. Kitchin and others vote against the motion, noting again that she was not advocating either way, and was happy to follow whatever was the will of the majority of Senators.

J. Hennessy commented that announcements could be hijacked by questions that had little or nothing to do with the announcement. J. Hennessy also noted that if a new announcement had to go to the end of the agenda, it would rarely be reached during a typical Senate meeting.

D. Benoit observed that the reason Senate did not reach the end of the agenda could be because of the length of time that was currently devoted to announcements. D. Benoit felt that it was impossible to get to the business of Senate if announcements and questions were taking too long, and didn't see a problem with this motion.

D. Holmberg added as a point of information, that if a new topic was being added to the agenda, a Senator could specify where they would like it to appear in the agenda. If the agenda had not yet been approved, the addition would only require a majority vote; if the agenda had already been approved, any request to add an item would require 2/3rds majority to agree.

A. Quema noted that she would vote against this motion, because once again she was not in favour of policing Senators, and because she felt that the previous motion, which held announcements to 10 minutes, should take care

of the problem.

J. Banks agreed with A. Quema and felt that the announcer of the question had the ability to keep their question germane to the announcement.

B. Anderson felt that this motion should be withdrawn for now until Senate see how the meetings work out as a result of the previous motion. This motion could be revisited if necessary.

H. Kitchin felt that it was not usually the announcements and the responses that took up so much time; it was more the debate during Senate that took time.

MOTION #3 DEFEATED.

Motion #4

Motion that individuals or committees bringing motions or recommendations to Senate will consult with the Deputy Chair or the Chair first, to make sure the wording is clear. Moved by D. Holmberg and seconded by D. Benoit.

D. Holmberg explained that individuals or committees sometimes bring forward motions that are unclear, or recommendations that are not in the form of a motion. This results in a great deal of time being spent by Senate having to word-smith items into clear motions. D. Holmberg noted that time would be reduced if motions could be vetted by the Deputy Chair or Chair of Senate ahead of the meeting, in order to get the wording clear and have items in a 'motion-ready' form. D. Holmberg noted that it would not be the intent to change any of the content; only the clarity of the wording.

S. Henderson stated that he did not feel that this should be formalized and felt that some of the word-smithing arises out of discussion at Senate.

H. Kitchin felt that she could support this motion and noted that a former Chair of Senate did encourage Senators to bring a motion to him for advice. H. Kitchin noted that someone could bring forward a motion without having a clear understanding of the Constitution.

J. Best preferred to keep this as a suggestion rather than a formal rule that Senate adopt. She felt that there was the potential, even without intention, for the intent of a motion to be changed by the Chair or Deputy Chair and did not want every motion to have to be formally submitted to the Chair.

A. Quema wondered whether this this motion could be tabled and revised in order to respond to J. Best's concerns. While recognizing that it was a good thing to educate, A. Quema noted the difficulty of separating language from content or form from content.

D. Holmberg stated that any Senator could make a motion to table the motion, in which case it could come back for discussion at a later time during the current meeting or at the next meeting; however, usually a motion is tabled when it is not the right time to talk about it, which does not seem to be the case here. D. Holmberg stated that if Senators believe that the wording of the motion should be altered to address their concerns, then they could instead move a formal amendment to the motion.

A. Quema asked if the motion was tabled could the original author of the

motion could come back with new wording.

D. Holmberg noted that once discussion has begun on a motion, it no longer “belongs” to the mover, and therefore the mover cannot unilaterally make wording changes. However, the mover (or any other Senator) could always move an amendment to effect wording changes.

C. Stanley spoke in favour of the motion and noted that Senate already has trouble getting through the business. C. Stanley noted that the motion is merely asking Senators to seek advice regarding the wording of their motion prior to Senate meetings.

D. Benoit felt that this added another layer of control in getting an item onto the agenda of Senate. D. Benoit noted that at present a Senator can just forward a notice of motion to the Secretary of Senate and it will get onto the agenda. D. Benoit wondered how much more time would now need to be allowed in order for the Chair or Deputy Chair to approve the wording of the motion. D. Benoit noted that if there was any back and forward between the originator of the motion and the Chair or Deputy Chair, the motion might not get onto the Senate agenda and be delayed for a further month.

Motion to postpone the discussion of Motion #4 to the next Senate meeting. Moved by D. Holmberg and seconded by J. Hennessy.

MOTION CARRIED.

P. Doerr returned the Chair to D. Holmberg.

6) Other Business

Motion #5 was carried over to the next meeting

7) Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Notice of Motions

Whereas the "Report on Senate Membership Discrepancies in the By-laws", approved by Senate in September 2012, identified multiple discrepancies and problems in the composition of Senate, we present the following Notice of Motions, and recommend that Senate approve these three motions at the November Senate meeting:

1. That the following changes be made to Article II of the Senate Constitution (Membership of Senate):

II. MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Senate of Acadia University shall be as follows: (See Appendix A):

Chair (see Note below) ###

Deputy-Chair (from the Elected Faculty Members of Senate) ** ###

Chancellor

President

Vice-President, Academic

Vice-President, **Enrolment and Student Services** (~~Student Affairs~~)-(non-voting) * +++

Vice President, Finance and Administration, and Chief Financial Officer ~~Chief Financial Officer~~ (non-voting) ***

Dean of Arts

Dean of Professional Studies

Dean of Pure and Applied Science

Dean of Theology

Dean of Research and Graduate Studies ++

Director of Open Acadia

University Librarian

Professional Librarian from among members of the University Community holding appointments as professional librarians. #

Registrar, Secretary to Senate (non-voting)

Student Union President ***** ++++

Twenty-seven members of Faculty, to include nine from each of the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science. This membership shall include one representative from each school.

A member of the Faculty of Theology #

Three members of the Board of Governors

Six students, at least one of whom shall be a graduate student ###

Three lay persons, nominated by the Senate Nominating Committee who are not eligible for membership under the roles and categories laid out above provided they are not full-time employees of Acadia at the time they are appointed lay members. ⁺

Note: The position of Chair is open to ex officio members of Senate, Senators, and Faculty members who are not Senators. Should an ex officio member of Senate be elected as Chairperson, there shall be no adjustment to the composition of Senate; should a Faculty member of Senate be elected as Chairperson, a replacement member shall be elected from the Faculty to which the Chair belongs; should a member from the Faculty at large be elected, there shall be no adjustment to the composition of Senate.

* Changed from Director of Student Services, September 1997

** Added March 1998

*** Amended April 1999; **changed from Chief Financial Officer, November 2012**

**** Added September 1999

+ Amended March 2001

++ Changed from Director of Research & Graduate Studies, February 2002

+++ Changed from Provost, June 2005; **and from Vice-President, Student Affairs, November 2012**

++++ Voting Status Conferred August 2007; **unable to confirm this statement; therefore voting status was affirmed/ reaffirmed by Senate in October 2012.**

Added/Amended September 2007

Changed from “five students...” in September 2007

Amended June 2010

2. That the following changes be made to Appendix A (Membership) of the Senate Constitution.

APPENDIX A - MEMBERSHIP

The current membership of the Senate of Acadia University was established by the Board of Governors on 4 May 1985 acting upon recommendations of the report Into the Fourth Quarter and using the authority granted the Board by Bill 108 of the Nova Scotia Legislature on 1 June 1983. The membership is as follows:

Rec. 7:1 That Senate have 49 members in four categories (**CURRENTLY 57 POSITIONS BECAUSE OF AMENDMENTS; NOTE THAT THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS MAY BE FEWER THAN THE NUMBER OF POSITIONS, DUE TO A SINGLE INDIVIDUAL HOLDING MULTIPLE POSITIONS**):

- (a) *Ex officio* members (16) **THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 19 IN MARCH 1998 WITH THE ADDITION OF THE DEPUTY CHAIR; HOWEVER, NOTE THE DEPUTY CHAIR WILL ALSO HOLD A POSITION AS ONE OF THE ELECTED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES.**

THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 18 WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF THE PRESIDENT, STUDENT UNION IN SEPTEMBER 1999. THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 17 WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF STUDENT AFFAIRS IN FEBRUARY, 1988

- (b) Student members (3) THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 5 BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS IN OCTOBER, 1992. THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 6 BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS IN NOVEMBER 1999.
- (c) Lay members (3)
- (d) Elected members (27) THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO 28 WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY IN MAY 1993, **AND TO 29 WITH THE ADDITION OF A PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIAN IN MAY 2007.**

7:2 (a) That the *ex officio* members be as follows:

1. The Chancellor
2. The President
3. The Vice-President (Academic)
4. The Vice-President (Administration)

ON 1 JULY 1994 THE TITLE OF THIS POSITION WAS CHANGED TO “VICE-PRESIDENT (FINANCE)”. THIS POSITION CHANGED TO CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER AND BECAME A NON-VOTING MEMBER

AT THE APRIL 1999 MEETING OF SENATE. AT THE NOVEMBER 2012 MEETING, THE TITLE OF THIS POSITION WAS UPDATED TO “VICE PRESIDENT, FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION, AND CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER.”

5. The Vice-President (Student Affairs) (non-voting)

AT THE NOVEMBER 2012 MEETING, THE TITLE OF THIS POSITION WAS UPDATED TO “VICE-PRESIDENT, ENROLMENT AND STUDENT SERVICES”.

IN 2004 THE POSITION OF "PROVOST" WAS ELIMINATED AND SENATE APPROVED THE POSITION OF VICE-PRESIDENT (STUDENT AFFAIRS) BE AN EX OFFICIO NON-VOTING MEMBER. IN 1997 THE POSITION OF “DIRECTOR OF STUDENT AFFAIRS” WAS ELIMINATED AND IT WAS RECOMMENDED AND SENATE APPROVED THE POSITION OF “PROVOST” BE AN EX OFFICIO MEMBER.

6. Three members of the Board of Governors

7. The Deans of the Faculties:

- (i) Arts
- (ii) Professional Studies
- (iii) Pure and Applied Science
- (iv) Theology (~~or the Associate Dean~~)

THE ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THEOLOGY WAS REMOVED AS AN ALTERNATE MEMBER TO THE DEAN OF THEOLOGY AT THE NOVEMBER 2012 MEETING OF SENATE.

8. The Dean of Research and Graduate Studies

9. The Director of Open Acadia

10. The University Librarian

11. The Registrar, who shall be Secretary (non-voting)

12. The Chair

13. The Deputy-Chair

14. The President, Student Union (~~non-voting~~)

THE PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENT UNION WAS GRANTED VOTING STATUS AT THE OCTOBER 2012 MEETING OF SENATE.

- (b) That two students be chosen by or under the auspices of the Student Representative Council and that a third student be a graduate, chosen by the graduate students. AT ITS OCTOBER 1992 MEETING, THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS APPROVED AN INCREASE IN STUDENT MEMBERSHIP ON SENATE TO FIVE STUDENTS. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT OF THESE FIVE STUDENT MEMBERS, ONE SHALL BE A GRADUATE STUDENT SELECTED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE ACADIA GRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION. **THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO SIX STUDENTS IN SEPTEMBER 2007 WITH THE ADDITION OF A STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY. IN NOVEMBER 2012, IT WAS CLARIFIED THAT THE SIX STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES SHALL CONSIST OF FOUR REPRESENTATIVES CHOSEN BY THE SRC; ONE GRADUATE STUDENT CHOSEN BY THE GRADUATE STUDENT ASSOCIATION; AND ONE THEOLOGY STUDENT CHOSEN BY THE ACADIA DIVINITY COLLEGE STUDENT ASSOCIATION IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, OR BY THE DEAN OF THEOLOGY IF THE STUDENT ASSOCIATION IS NOT ABLE TO MAKE AN APPOINTMENT IN A TIMELY FASHION.**

- (c) That there be not more than three lay members of Senate, chosen by Senate.

- (d) That there be twenty-seven members of faculty, nine chosen from each of the Faculties of Arts, Management and Education, and Pure and Applied Science.

THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO TWENTY-EIGHT BY SENATE AT ITS MEETING OF 5 MAY 1993 WHEN IT ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION FROM A SENATE *AD HOC* COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY/DIVINITY COLLEGE RELATIONS (Minute 4 (c) #923--08):

“A member of the Faculty of Theology, chosen by the Faculty, sit as a non-voting member on the Senate of Acadia University; this member shall have voting rights as a delegate of the Principal/Dean when the Principal/Dean is unable to attend the Senate Meeting.” (N.B., As of June 1995, the Board of Governors had not approved the second part of the recommendation, concerning voting rights.)

THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY REPRESENTATIVE WAS GRANTED VOTING STATUS AT THE MAY 2007 MEETING OF SENATE. THIS CHANGE IN STATUS WAS APPROVED BY THE BOARD, AS ANNOUNCED AT THE SEPTEMBER 2007 MEETING OF SENATE.

THIS NUMBER WAS INCREASED TO TWENTY-NINE BY SENATE AT THE MAY 2007 MEETING, WITH THE ADDITION OF A PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIAN, ELECTED BY THE PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS. THIS ADDITION WAS APPROVED BY THE BOARD, AS INDICATED IN THE SEPTEMBER 2007 SENATE MINUTES.

- 7:3 Within the provisions of 7:2 (d) that each School be guaranteed one place on Senate, the appointee to be named by the School concerned and chosen in a manner determined by the individual schools.
- 7:4 That the term of service for senators in the categories listed in 7:1 (c) and (d) above be three years.
- 7:5 That Senate choose annually its own chairman. If an *ex officio* member of Senate is chosen, there shall be no adjustment to the composition of Senate. If an individual is chosen from categories (b), (c) or (d), a replacement shall be chosen. AT ITS MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 1991 SENATE ADOPTED A MOTION THAT THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE BRING FORWARD THE NAME OR NAMES OF PERSONS FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE TO SERVE AS CHAIR. IT WAS NOTED THAT NOMINATIONS FROM THE FLOOR ARE ALSO ACCEPTABLE. AT ITS MEETING OF MARCH 1998 SENATE ADOPTED A MOTION THAT A DEPUTY-CHAIR OF SENATE BE APPOINTED FROM AMONG THE ELECTED FACULTY MEMBERS BY THE SAME PROCEDURE AS THE CHAIR OF THE SENATE.

3. That the following changes be made to Article III, Section 4, of the Senate Constitution (Terms and Duties of Membership).

Four student members of Senate ~~Undergraduate student members of Senate and Senate Committees~~ shall be appointed by the Acadia Students' Representative Council. The term of service shall be the same as that of the SRC which appointed them. **One student member of Senate** ~~Graduate student members of Senate and Senate Committees~~ shall be appointed by the Graduate Students' Association and shall

serve a one-year term commencing in September of each year. **One student member of Senate shall normally be appointed by the Acadia Divinity College Student Association, and shall serve a one-year term commencing in September of each year. In the event the Acadia Divinity College Student Association is not able to select a representative in a timely fashion in a given year, the appointment shall be made by the Dean of Theology. Unless otherwise specified, student members of Senate Committees shall be appointed by the Acadia Students' Representative Council.**

Senate By-Laws Committee (SBLC)
Annual Report to Senate
July 2012

Committee Membership:

Dr. Heather A. Kitchin, Faculty of Arts (Chair)

Barbara Anderson, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science (Secretary)

Dr. William Brackney, Faculty of Theology

Dr. Jim MacLeod, Faculty of Professional Studies

The Committee met twice over the 2011/2012 academic year, on February 3, 2012 and June 5, 2012. Meetings were scheduled as matters were referred from Senate. In keeping with its mandate, the Senate By-Laws Committee determined that it would remain advisory and responsive in nature, and to deal with matters as they arose and as referred by Senate.

Senate Chair, Diane Holmberg issued a request that the by-laws committee review the problem of non-staggered committee memberships. The SBLC agreed that this matter fell under the mandate of the Recording Secretary of Senate.

While reviewing Senate documents, Senate Chair, Diane Holmberg discovered various discrepancies in the By-laws related to membership and voting rights. These matters were addressed at the Committee's second meeting, at which time Diane Holmberg and Barbara Anderson agreed to work together on an *ad hoc* basis to review the inconsistencies by the end of August 2012. The results will be addressed in the SBLC's subsequent annual report.

At the second meeting, Senate By-laws Committee agreed that:

- Roles and responsibilities need to be clarified with respect to:
 - whose responsibility it is to update changes to the membership language in the Senate By-laws;
 - the proper process for making these changes;
 - the meaning of the term 'incorporate' in (1) under duties of the By-Laws Committee;
 - procedures involving the SBLC in relation to incorporating changes to the Constitution.
- The timing for conducting a review of the By-laws of Senate should be considered; the SBLC recommended this be in 2012-13. It was agreed that it would be helpful to have:
 - clearer language on policy and procedures for each Standing Committee member;
 - a more detailed description of the roles and responsibilities of the Senate Chair;
 - a review of Senate Standing Committees, their mandates, memberships and whether possible to eliminate or collapse some of the committees.

Over 2012-13, the SBLC will work towards developing a work plan to begin addressing the above matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather A. Kitchin, Chair

Interim Report of the Senate Academic Planning Committee

November 6, 2012

The Academic Planning Committee (APC), comprising Drs. Barry Moody, Heather Hemming, Peter Williams, David McMullin, Terrance Weatherbee, David Duke, Tom Herman and Mr. Kyle Power, has met twice to date (September 19 and October 24, 2012).

September 19, 2012

At its inaugural meeting (September 19), the Chair provided a brief review of the activities and outcomes of the 2011-12 *Ad hoc* Academic Planning & Priorities Committee (AP&PC) and shared some general thoughts on the purpose of the APC and the importance of engaging the broader campus community. He also reminded members of the pre-eminence of the institutional good in the Committee's deliberations and that all members represent the entire academic sector of Acadia University rather than individual Faculties.

The defined mandate of the APC is "to make recommendations to Senate on matters relating to academic principles and planning. In carrying out its work, the APC shall consult widely with all stakeholders and relevant bodies on campus. The APC shall report regularly to Senate, no less than two times per year."

Committee members agreed that as an over-arching principle, the APC should be consultative and transparent. Due to its relatively small size, it was agreed that informal and open discussion would be encouraged and would not impede efficient operation of the Committee.

The following meeting schedule was confirmed:

Wednesday, October 24 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. KCIC Meeting Room
Wednesday, November 24 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, December 19 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, January 23 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, February 13 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, March 27 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, April 24 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom
Wednesday, May 22 – 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FC Alumni Boardroom

The Committee discussed transitioning from the AP&PC to the APC, acknowledging the expectation that the APC would both explore and construct a planning process and consider for recommendation potential changes to the existing academic structure.

The APC acknowledged that the AP&PC had identified the need for improving both integration and communication of existing academic planning, recognizing that issues of resource allocation and of planning are occasionally confused or conflated. T. Weatherbee spoke to the "Start-up Activity Agenda" which was previously recommended and approved by Senate. The Agenda was crafted by a sub-committee of the AP&PC charged with exploring the extent of linkages among current academic processes at Acadia, and best practices at other academic institutions. Their analysis noted that the existing suite of deadlines for processes on campus did not facilitate planning in academic units.

In shaping its activities and approach going forward, the APC reflected on the challenges faced by the previous AP&PC, noting that it was hindered by its large size and lack of a clearly established mandate. The APC agreed that it has the opportunity to identify useful non-threatening processes that would improve life on campus. It also agreed that it is crucial that this committee make tangible recommendations to Senate for its consideration, and that it recognize current constraints to resource allocation.

The Committee also discussed its potential relationship with the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) and agreed that information flow between the two is critical, with the APRC providing “small p” planning, and sharing its recommendations for review by the APC if they impacted on the “big P” planning of the APC. It was recognized that, like the APRC, the APC is advisory and informative, with the capacity to make recommendations to Senate, which is the final arbiter of academic planning.

The inaugural meeting closed with identification of several key areas for further discussion:

1. Revisiting and restatement of Acadia’s key values, and mechanisms for incorporating those values into our planning;
2. Identification of Acadia’s optimal capacity;
3. Exploration of “end states” for enrolment, including quotas;
4. Insuring sustainability of small programs;
5. Insuring integrity of large programs;
6. Assessing existing unit structures.

Several specific items were identified for the October meeting of the APC:

1. Outline the APC’s activities and its relationship to Senate. (T. Weatherbee agreed to prepare a 3-4 page document for modification and approval by the committee prior to it going to Senate);
2. Begin to articulate a process for improving support for inter/trans-disciplinary programs.
3. Begin to pursue and restate the value of a Liberal Arts education, with first step to define “end state”.
4. Identify the nature and structure of community consultation (e.g. unsolicited vs. solicited discussion papers)

October 24, 2012

In its October 24 meeting the APC discussed the “Proposed Academic Planning Committee Planning Framework” document prepared by T. Weatherbee (TW). TW provided an overview of the document, suggesting that the key role of a committee such as this is to “plan for the planning” rather than do the actual planning itself. The structures and processes outlined in the document are standard planning frameworks that are employed in business and elsewhere when planning complex activities. It breaks down those complexities into simple, but synchronised, building blocks that can be tackled independently but in an integrated format.

The initial and key stage of the process is to define an achievable end-state and aim at that. The end-state operates at multiple levels, from a macro-focus (e.g., the inter-relationship between the faculties in the learning process) down to mid- or narrow-focus (e.g., which courses in Arts should be available for a Science student, and so on). External shocks can have both positive and negative effects on the desired end-state. The planning process can accommodate such shocks (a) in the negative environment by producing a set of robust values that are relatively immune to constraints and (b) in the positive environment not by altering the scope of the end-state but by altering its timeline. This kind of robust planning environment is, by definition, preferable to short-term, often ad hoc and responsive crisis management. The flexibility and scope of the planning structure allow one to adapt to new environments by recognising the impact of those new environments (new costs, new opportunities) across the board.

Discussion ensued regarding the Strategic Plan (SP) as an element that could be incorporated into the Academic Planning Process. The point was made that the SP does in fact contain an end state that could be used as an achievable goal of the planning process. The discussion then moved to the end state of the planning process itself and the SP. From AP&PC work, we have unit-response data on how units see their programs within the SP mission statement, especially in the provision of a sustainable liberal-based education.

The Committee briefly reviewed the Values and Mission sections of the SP and then focused on the “Acadia Education” section of the SP (pp. 4-5), which describes explicit components of the educational process at Acadia. The Committee discussed and recognized the relevance of the existing components that comprise the “Acadia Education”, suggesting the possible modification of the fourth component (on environment and social Issues), and the addition of a sixth – Community Engagement, which has in recent years become central to the Institution’s activities, academic and otherwise.

In preparation for the November APC meeting, a sub-committee of P. Williams, D. McMullin and D. Duke agreed to prepare a summary end state document, and all members were charged with generating thematic lines along which planning processes could be developed.

A brief general discussion of interdisciplinary / transdisciplinary program delivery and resourcing followed, concluding with the arrival of the Chair of Senate, Dr. Holmberg, and a shift in discussion to cooperation on planning issues between Senate and the Board of Governors.

Respectfully submitted,
Tom Herman, Chair

Motion:

The Senate Curriculum Committee moves that the modifications to the Bachelor of Computer Science with Specialization be approved by Senate.

Department/School: **Jodrey School of Computer Science**

Acadia University Senate Curriculum Committee 2011-2012
Form 4: Proposed Modification to a program

Presented to Faculty Council? Yes, presented and passed at the April 25, 2012 meeting of the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science.

Briefly (in one paragraph) outline the nature of the changes you are requesting to your program. Modification brought to Bachelor of Computer Science with Specialization see p. 70 of Calendar 1.

There are three changes:

- COMP 3403 (Analysis of Algorithms) and COMP 3703 (Translators) are removed as required courses from our Specializations.
- A new Software Development program replaces the E-Commerce program as a more general program about developing desk-top and web-centric systems.
- Two Psychology courses are removed from the Mobile and Ubiquitous Computing specialization and COMP 4343 (Networks and Distributed Systems) is added as a required course.

2. Briefly state the reason for requesting this modification. Please be specific.

The reasons for each of the changes:

- Many universities offer industry focused software development (with less theory) as well as the more traditional computer science degrees (where theory remains an important requirement). The removal of the two theory courses from the general specialization requirements will make these programs attractive to a large range of students by giving them greater flexibility in course selection from the School and across Acadia. Students can still optionally take COMP 3403 and 3703.
- The new Software Development program places greater emphasis on software systems analysis, design and integration, as well as development methodologies, team work, interpersonal communications, and project management skills. The largest percentage growth in the ICT sector is expected in software development (35% increase from 2011-2016).
- The material on usability in the two Psychology courses is sufficiently covered in our HCI course. COMP 4343 (Networks and Distributed Systems) is an important requirement for this particular specialization.

3. Will the modification alter, in any substantive way, the way your program is currently delivered?

Yes No

If you checked no, please proceed to question 7. If you checked yes, briefly state how the modification will change the nature of your program.

4. Has the proposed modification been discussed with students?

Yes No

5. Do students approve of the modification?

Yes No

6. Are the effects of this program change restricted to your own Department/School?

Yes No

If you checked No to any of the questions 4-6 above, please explain your answer(s).

7. Indicate the exact changes you want made to the existing program description in University Calendar. We recommend typing in the relevant sections of the current calendar, and indicating deletions to the existing description with strikeouts and additions to the existing description with bold type. (*Preferably do this in WORD and use the Track Changes feature on the Tools Menu. However, any system that clearly indicates what changes are needed is acceptable.*)

Bachelor of Computer Science with Specialization

1. Comp 1113, 1123, 2103, 2113, 2203, 2213, 2663, 2903, 3343, ~~3403~~, 3613, 3663, ~~3703~~, 3713, 3753, 4983, and Math 1413 or 1313, and 1323 or 1333, each with C- or better (48h)
2. A set of required specialty courses, each completed with a grade of C- or better. The specialties and their required courses, are:

~~**Electronic Commerce:** Comp 2513, 2523, 3503, (9h from Comp 3513, 3583, 4343, or 4583), Busi 1703, 2213, 2413, 2053, 3h other Busi, Comm 1213 (36h); 15h Busi.~~

Software Development: Comp 2513, 3513, 3583, 3773; Comm 1213; 12h from the School of Business Administration; 9h with permission of the school. (36h);

Game Development: Comp 3553, 3583, 3773, 4343, 4613, 4553, Math 2313, ~~Comp 4983~~. Plus 15h with permission of the school (36h);

Mobile and Ubiquitous Computing: Comp 2513, 2523, 3583, **4343**, 4583; Psyc 1013, 1023, 2143; ~~2013; (Psyc 2023 or 2143)~~; plus 12h with permission of the School (36h).

3. Math 1013, 1023, 2233, each with C- or better (9h)
4. 6h selected from English, Art at the 1000-level, Classics, Comparative Religion, a single language other than English, History, Music (not applied, vocal or instrumental methods, or practical studies), Philosophy, Theology (Theo 3013/23, Bibl 2013/23, Gree 3013/23), Women's and Gender Studies “or Comm 1213 and 1223 (if specialization is not Software Development)”.
5. 9h of courses from the Faculty of Arts (not Econ 2613, 2623, or Soci 3103).
6. ~~6h of non-computer science courses~~ 12h of electives with at most 6h in Comp
7. A minimum CGPA of 2.00 is required to be eligible to graduate.
8. The Comp 4983 project must be in the area of the specialization.

8. Will this program change the result in the addition of any new courses?

Yes No

If yes, please list all new course numbers below, and fill out Form 2 (New Course Proposal) for each.

9. Will this program change result in the deletion of any existing courses?

Yes No

If yes, please list all deleted course numbers below, and fill out Form 2 (Proposed Course Deletion) for each.

10. Will this program change result in substantive modifications to any existing courses?

Yes No

If yes, please list all affected course numbers below, and fill out Form 3 (Proposed Course Modification) for each.

11. Other relevant information.

**Motions Regarding Senate Procedures,
for Senate's Consideration**

General Disclaimer: These motions represent suggestions people have made to me regarding possible changes to Senate procedures. I wish to make it clear that although I am bringing forward these motions for Senate's consideration, as Chair I am not advocating either position (i.e., supporting or defeating these motions), and I will personally abstain from all votes on these motions. There are always advantages and disadvantages to any approach; were I a Senator voting on these motions, I would weigh the pros and cons, and no doubt end up supporting some of these motions and opposing others. As Chair, though, I am simply trying to find the proper balance between encouraging full and open debate and discussion, while also dealing relatively efficiently with the business at hand and getting to all agenda items in a timely fashion. I am perfectly happy to go either way on each of these issues, according to the preference of the majority of Senators.

Motion #1, Regarding Senate Attendance

Background: There is a rule in the Senate Constitution regarding attendance at Senate that has not been enforced in recent memory, to my knowledge or the knowledge of others on Senate Executive. It seems pointless to have a rule on the books that is not observed, but I am reluctant to make a unilateral decision to begin enforcing the rule, thereby going against years of past practice. I am looking for Senate's guidance as to whether I should begin enforcing this rule. If Senate prefers not to enforce the rule (i.e., this motion is defeated), then I would recommend removing the rule from the Constitution, and I will bring forward a Notice of Motion next month to amend the Constitution accordingly.

Motion: That the Chair shall enforce the following rule in the Senate Constitution (Part III, point 5): "If any elected or appointed member of Senate, other than ex officio members, misses three consecutive regular meetings, that member's seat shall be declared vacant and shall be filled by recourse to the appropriate electoral or appointment procedure." To give fair warning, counts of absences shall begin at the November meeting.

Motion #2, Regarding Usual Length of Announcements

Background: Some Senators have noted that the amount of time devoted to announcements seems to be increasing. It will often be half or even $\frac{3}{4}$ of an hour into the meeting before we finish announcements and start in on the main agenda. That is frequently because people have questions; also, the questions are sometimes on other matters, not directly related to the announcements that have been made. Announcements seem to be evolving into a sort of "Question Period". The advantage is that it provides a monthly public forum for Senators to ask senior administrators timely questions on a wide variety of topics. The disadvantage is that considerable time may be devoted to questions of interest to only a few, at the cost of not getting to the main agenda items. This motion and the next one represent suggestions I have received to focus the announcement period; however, if Senators prefer the current open-ended Q & A approach, they can defeat these motions and we will continue with the status quo. Note I am going with a 5-minute time limit per speaker as that was the suggestion I received; the motion could certainly be amended to represent a longer time for some or all speakers, if desired.

Motion: That the Chair shall enforce a standing special order to limit announcements to five minutes per speaker (including time for questions).

Note: A “standing special order” would mean that would be the default time; however, it could always be extended if needed. If those making announcements know in advance that they will need more time in a given month, they can ask for additional time, which will be noted and approved as part of the agenda. Under normal circumstances, however, the Chair would stop the announcement period when five minutes are up. If the speaker is almost done, the Chair can ask if there are any objections to extending the time briefly, and will do so if there are no objections. If considerably more time should turn out to be needed, any Senator (including the announcer) could move to extend the debate, and if 2/3 of Senators agree, additional time can be allotted.

Motion #3, Regarding Questions during Announcements

Background: During debate on motions, all statements must be germane to the topic at hand; i.e., you cannot bring up issues that are unrelated to the motion that is currently being discussed. If speakers do so, the Chair rules them out of order, and the speaker must wait until the appropriate time to make their statement. I have not been enforcing such a rule during announcements; instead, I have been allowing any questions that Senators wish to pose, whether related to the announcements or not. If a majority of Senators so wished, however, questions could be restricted to those germane to the announcements that have been made.

Motion: That the Chair shall rule questions that are not germane to the topic(s) of a speaker’s announcements as being out of order.

Note: Senators who know in advance that they want to bring up a particular topic/issue in a given meeting are always free to put that issue on the agenda, either as a motion or as a discussion item, and have it approved as part of the regular agenda. If an issue should arise during the course of a meeting, any Senator is also free to make a motion to add a topic/issue to the agenda (note that revising an agenda after it has already been approved requires 2/3 majority approval; note also that adding motions to an agenda on the day they will be voted on requires the approval of a majority of the entire membership, in order to waive Notice of Motion). Therefore, if a question is ruled not germane, it can always be added to the agenda as a new item; it simply requires a majority or 2/3 of Senators, as appropriate, to agree that they wish to devote Senate time to that particular topic.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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