

The meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Tuesday, October 9, 2012 beginning at 4:05pm with chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 43 members present.

- 1) Approval of the Agenda

The Chair requested that items 5. d), e), and f) be moved to become items 5 a), b), and c) so that guests who had come to speak to these items could leave sooner if they wished. It was moved by W. Slights, seconded by B. Anderson that the agenda as amended be approved.
MOTION CARRIED.
- 2) Minutes of the meeting of September 10, 2012

It was moved by J. Best, seconded by J. Hennessy that the minutes of the meeting of September 10 be approved as distributed.
MOTION CARRIED.
- 3) Announcements
 - a) From the Chair of Senate

Regrets were received from N. Clarke, H. Gardner, J. Holt, R. Ivany, A. Vibert.
The Chair welcomed four guests to the meeting: L. Davidson, assistant registrar and member of the Timetable Instruction Hours and Examinations Committee; J. Hooper, former Chair of the Scholarships Prizes and Awards Committee; D. Currie, member of the Academic Technologies Committee; and A. Robbins, attending in the place of H. Gardner.
The Chair reported that she had informed P. Jewer that Senate had agreed in principle to the concept of the Senate Academic Planning Committee and Academic Resource Committee of the Board working together. No word has been received from P. Jewer. D. Holmberg will follow up. In any case, the next step is for the full Board to consider the proposal. Both the Governance Committee and the Board Executive approved the idea in principle, but formal approval from the full Board will be considered at the meeting on October 12.
A Senate Orientation was held on October 1 with a number of new Senators present. It was a good session with a useful exchange of questions and comments.
Senate Executive met on September 24. At that time, it was agreed the Executive would meet again near the middle and end of the academic year. The September meeting was comprised mostly of updates on items in progress, such as the

conversion from alpha to numeric grades; the procedures that might be considered concerning interdisciplinary programs; and how best to address any requests for curriculum changes that involve more than one Faculty. The WGST program review contains some recommendations that may be helpful in moving forward on interdisciplinary studies issues. The Academic Program Review Committee has the report from the WGST review committee; recommendations will likely be made to Senate in January. These recommendations may inform the larger discussion of interdisciplinary programs in general at Acadia.

The Academic Planning Committee is meeting monthly. The first report to Senate is expected in November. The expectation is that the report will be provided in written form in advance of the meeting, so that Senators will have the opportunity to consider the contents before the November meeting. Other reports will be forthcoming at about the middle and end of the academic year.

The Chair has received suggestions and ideas from the Executive and others regarding the best way to deal with Senate procedures. While the Chair is reluctant to curtail discussion, there is a need to make progress on the agendas. There will be motions for consideration at the November meeting regarding Senate procedures, to get ideas and generate discussion. The Chair reminded Senators of various things they can do if they feel debate is bogging down and they want to move it forward: move to refer the matter back to committee, move to postpone discussion until the next meeting or later in the same meeting, call the question, or move to table the motion. Any of these motions can be made between speakers by any voting member of Senate. The motion will need a seconder and must be agreed to by 2/3 of the members present.

- b) From the Vice President Academic T. Herman conveyed the President's regrets, noting that he was at a meeting with provincial Deputy Ministers and the Presidents of NSERC and SSHRC in which President Ivany felt it was imperative that the voice of small universities be heard. T. Herman promoted the upcoming BMO lecture being held on October 17. Victoria Lennox, CEO of Start-Up Canada will be speaking on Building an Entrepreneurial Ecosystem. T. Herman congratulated Alberto Accardi, an Acadia student in the School of Nutrition and Dietetics, who has won a 20011/12 Canadian North Student Research Prize. The prize is given for

work on a substantive issue of importance to the North. His project focused on access to food.

Congratulations were also extended to J. Guiney Yallop, L. Dalton, C. Morley and P. Rockwell for their hard work in hosting an Arts Based Research Symposium on campus. The Symposium was supported by the Harrison McCain Foundation and the Arts Based Research Network at Acadia. Cheryl McLean gave an excellent keynote address on the creative arts and interdisciplinary research.

From P. Williams

P. Williams suggested a moment of silence to remember two Acadia colleagues who passed away this past week. Lynn Chipman and Dr. Millard Cherry were both long-serving members of the Acadia community. Members rose and observed a moment of silence in their honour.

4. Time-sensitive Items

a) Approval of the List of Potential Graduates for October 2012

It was moved by D. Benoit, seconded by E. Callaghan that the list as circulated be approved. Congratulations were extended to D. Currie whose name was on the list.
MOTION CARRIED.

b) Nominating Committee: Election of Chair, TTTCAC

J. Hennessy nominated A. Quéma as Chair of the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee. D. Holmberg called for any additional nominations from the floor. As there were none, A. Quéma was elected by acclamation.

5. Senate Committee Annual Reports

It was moved by D. Benoit, seconded by S. Major that the Senate Committee Annual Reports be received.

(APPENDIX A) Timetable Instruction Hours and Examinations Committee – the Registrar commented on the report. A. Quéma reported that faculty members in Arts are concerned about removing the committee from Senate. Perhaps there will be significant work for it to do in the future regarding the timetable.

(APPENDIX B) Scholarships Prizes and Awards Committee – J. Hooper spoke to the report as the former Chair of the committee. He explained that the reports are one and two years old because of the timing of the reporting. Results of scholarship offers to incoming students are not available until

October, so May reporting is not the best time for this committee. He also stated that the committee had to re-evaluate the process used to award scholarships when high schools stopped ranking their students. This information was very helpful in determining the relative strength of applicants. Currently, grades in grade 11 and 12 make up about 50% of the score used (40% of the score for grade 11 marks and 60% for grade 12), and the remaining 50% is based on the student's application, personal statement, and references. In 2010, there was a 44% acceptance rate of offers made. The rate in 2011 rose to 49%. Because of the increased percentage, the pool of money available must go further, so adjustments in the value of scholarships had to be made. R. Karsten is now Chair of the Scholarship Prizes and Awards Committee.

(APPENDIX C) Academic Technologies Committee- D. Currie reported that finding methods for backing up data for faculty, particularly part-time faculty, was seen as a priority. The recommendations from the committee were intentionally vague, in order to allow latitude to whomever receives the information. The committee recommended that technology requirements be incorporated into class scheduling, so situations would not arise where a specific technology was needed to deliver the course but it was not available in the classroom that was assigned. The committee also discussed classroom technology as it related to docking stations. It was noted that a communication strategy was needed; more work will be done on this. A. Quéma asked if the committee was consulted regarding the selection of laptops for faculty. D. Currie indicated that they were not directly consulted. Their role was more related to where technology interacts with faculty as it relates to policy, rather than with specific operational decisions.

(APPENDIX D) Academic Integrity Committee – The Registrar spoke to this report at the May meeting. S. Major expressed concern about the recommendation that the committee be disbanded. Although the committee did not meet, she was not convinced that it should not have met. Perhaps it needs to become more active or the mandate should be transferred to another committee. D. Holmberg stated that the status quo would remain for the moment, until any changes are approved by Senate. The committee should feel free to continue meeting

and pursuing its mandate until any potential replacement is formally agreed upon.

(APPENDIX E) Archives Committee – P. Doer reported that the committee has been revived and has a meeting scheduled for later this month. A more detailed report will be available in May. He said that the committee had become inactive because the previous chair had left the university and no one knew who the new chair would be. All members were waiting for someone else to call a meeting.

D. Holmberg said that there is a pressing need to solve this issue of calling initial meetings in the absence of a chair, as it was causing trouble for a number of committees that had become inactive for the same reason.

(APPENDIX F) Faculty Development Committee – D. Holmberg stated that no meeting of this committee had been held during the 2011/12 academic year. According to old Senate minutes, this has been a perennial problem with this committee. It was almost disbanded several times before. That was not done because Senate felt the committee's work was important and needed to be done. Each time the committee was almost disbanded it would revive and become active again temporarily; however, the revival was always short lived and the committee is now dormant again. S. Major suggested that this committee could become more active by focusing on the scholarship of teaching and learning, especially in light of the loss of the Learning Commons.

(APPENDIX G) Curriculum Committee – A. Quéma commented on the report. It is an update of the interim report presented in the winter when the curriculum cycle for the year was completed. Discussions related to interdisciplinary studies will be useful to the committee. J. Hennessy asked about the link for courses with a significant writing component, mentioned within a curriculum change that had been proposed by the Faculty of Science. P. Williams confirmed that there was no such list available, as the change to the Science curriculum that was ultimately approved by Senate did not include such a list.

(APPENDIX H) Admissions & Academic Standing Policy Committee – T. Herman confirmed that there had been no meeting of this committee in 2011/12 but one has already been held this academic year and more are planned to discuss some outstanding issues and new ones that have come to the fore.

(APPENDIX I) Open Acadia – J. Banks reported that although the Board had not met, there has been a lot of growth at Open Acadia during the last year. Work is ongoing to diversify the background of students in the EAP program. Over 80% of students graduating from the EAP program continue their studies in a credit program at Acadia. There are some indications that they are more successful than students admitted directly without being required to take EAP. Additional M.Ed. cohorts have begun studies this year and new certificate programs for teachers in mathematics and computer science are being developed. A new professional development opportunity for family studies teachers is being launched this fall. As well, the training begun last year for the Coast Guard College is continuing. J. Banks thanked Open Acadia's campus partners for their enthusiasm for the work. H. Kitchin asked about the possibility for students to take an Open Acadia course as part of their regular load. As the diversity of courses offered on campus drops, it would be helpful if students could take an Open Acadia course during the academic year without paying extra for it. J. Banks confirmed that discussions regarding this issue have taken place, but since most Open Acadia courses are offered by Acadia faculty, there has been stress on the Open Acadia offerings, as well as the on-campus ones.

E. Callaghan asked if where students came from who take online courses was tracked. J. Banks confirmed that the information was available. The majority of the students come from Acadia. The number of students for whom Open Acadia proctors exams for online courses from other universities has doubled this year. This implies that student demand for online courses is increasing.

(APPENDIX J) Admissions & Academic Standing Appeals Committee – T. Herman presented the report (see attached).

(APPENDIX K) Academic Program Review Committee – T. Herman reported that the committee met 15 times during the academic year. Prioritized recommendations were presented to Senate for three program reviews. Recommendations for four more will be coming to Senate this semester. He thanked the committee for all their hard work.

(APPENDIX L) Academic Discipline Appeals Committee – D. Holmberg reported that this committee has not met in several years. It only meets when required, and that has not been the case recently. It is possible that this committee could be formed

on an ad hoc basis as needed, or could be combined with some other standing committee, rather than continuing as a separate standing committee.

A. Quéma suggested that if the mandates could be preserved, the Admissions & Academic Standing Policy Committee, the Academic Integrity Committee and the Academic Discipline Appeals Committee could potentially merge.

MOTION to receive the reports was CARRIED.

6a) Possible Review of Senate Standing Committees

D. Holmberg stated that the last time the standing committees of Senate were reviewed was in the early 1990's. Based on an informal vote of members present, it was agreed that there was a need for a new review now. H. Kitchin suggested striking a committee to undertake the work. D. Holmberg suggested that the Bylaws Committee has this task as part of its mandate, so it would be the logical choice (i.e., By-laws committee's mandate includes "To monitor the evolution of the academic committees and to recommend changes to the committee structure of Faculty Councils and other bodies at the University for which it is responsible"). It was moved by S. Major, that the matter be referred to the Bylaws Committee.

D. Holmberg indicated that Robert's Rules of Orders suggests that adding a date for committees to report back to the full body is generally helpful. S. Major suggested that a preliminary report be ready for the January 2013 meeting. T. Herman seconded the motion.

S. Henderson requested that formal opportunities for input from faculty members be provided by the Committee. K. Powers requested that some preliminary information be provided by the committee before input was sought. A. Quéma suggested that there might even be an appetite for new committees.

MOTION CARRIED.

b) Motion from the VPA of the ASU re: Senate Membership

It was moved by K. Power, seconded by E. Cochrane that the President of the Acadia Students' Union have full voting rights in Senate.

Currently there are four membership lists relating to the composition of Senate. The lists do not agree on the voting status of the President of the ASU (three say voting, one says

non-voting). The position was clearly initially created as a non-voting one, and searches of Senate minutes have not yet revealed when or if the position was converted to a voting one. However, practice in recent years has clearly been for the ASU President to vote. A formal vote on this motion will remove any confusion. A. Quéma asked if ex officio membership was connected to voting rights. D. Holmberg explained that “ex officio” indicates the person holds membership on a committee automatically by virtue of their position; they do not have to be elected to the committee. That is a separate issue from voting rights; ex officio members may or may not be voting members. For example, on Senate the President and VP Academic are voting members, but the VP Administration and VP Enrolment and Student Services are nonvoting members.
MOTION CARRIED.

c) Report from the Academic

Planning and Priorities Committee

(APPENDIX M) The recommendations were discussed at the June meeting, but not the themes. A. Quéma asked if the themes would be used by the APC to structure their activities. T. Herman said that the ten themes informed the new APC. Some were already discussed at the first meeting. He considered the discussion of the themes implicit in the mandate of the committee. The APPC met 16 times last year and did a tremendous amount of work to develop the themes. It would be unfortunate if the new committee did not pay attention to the foundation laid by the APPC. Lots of constructive feedback and good ideas have been received.
The APC will be reporting to Senate at the November meeting.

7) New Business

a) Motions from the Dean of
Research & Graduate Studies on
behalf of the Senate Graduate
Studies Committee

(APPENDIX N) It was moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by W. Brackney, that the motion (a) on page 29 of the agenda be approved as circulated. D. MacKinnon spoke to the motion. Concerns had been raised in the Graduate Studies Committee regarding the appropriate distance between the student /supervisor and the external examiner for the thesis. This motion is meant to articulate what the Committee considers an appropriate distance. The motion has been agreed to by all the Graduate Coordinators. J. Guiney Yallop questioned whether or not this new regulation would apply to portfolio examinations

for the PhD in Educational Studies. D. MacKinnon said that it would not.

MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by D. Benoit that the motion (b) on page 29 of the agenda be approved as circulated. D. MacKinnon spoke to the motion. Currently, the eligible GPA for the receipt of an Acadia Graduate Award (AGA) is higher than the GPA required for entry into most programs. The committee concluded that if a student is eligible for admission into the program, they should also be eligible for an AGA. S. Major questioned lowering the standard when little money was available for awards. H. Kitchin asked if any units admitted graduate students with a GPA of 2.67. D. MacKinnon confirmed that some do. H. Kitchin said that the sociology department has recently raised the GPA required for admission to their graduate program. D. MacKinnon replied that departments could set higher levels if they chose to do so. The rationale would be the same – if the student qualified for entry to the program, they should qualify for the award. A. Quéma said there should be a distinction between acceptance into a program and qualifying for an award. C. Stanley stated that it was important to distinguish among various grading systems from other parts of the world. Sometimes grades that look particularly low are a reflection of the system, rather than the quality of the student. He also pointed out that with the limited number of AGAs available, it is still possible that they will not be awarded to students who meet the minimum requirement. He asked about the current GPA requirement to be awarded an AGA. D. MacKinnon agreed that other systems of education produced students with very different grades. However, this is taken into account when admission is considered. There are several documents available from other universities in Canada where equivalents have been established, including one from the University of Alberta. He also stated that at the moment, the AGAs go to students that have a GPA higher than 3.0. D. Benoit said that in Computer Science, a large percentage of graduate students are international and it is sometimes difficult to equate grades to our system. He felt that if students were accepted into the program, it seemed reasonable that they should be eligible for an AGA. The awards are particularly important to international students. J. Banks noted that while the minimum GPA for graduate admission is 3.0 in the five universities that he

checked, this is a separate issue from the one being discussed today.

J. Whidden – students being admitted to graduate programs with various GPAs with an inconsistent base standard could cause problems when AGAs are awarded. D. MacKinnon confirmed that some units only admit students if an award is available for them, while others choose to admit students without financial support. He also pointed out that the AGA is not a scholarship; it is a work award. B. Moody said that he was uncomfortable with lowering standards, and would prefer to raise the GPA. If the change is being made out of concern for international students, a change of language to '3.0 or equivalent' would address the problem. Just getting into the program should not qualify a student for an award. A. Quéma wanted to know if this matter could be referred back to the committee. She also questioned whether or not the motion was supported unanimously by the committee members. D. Holmberg confirmed that a motion to refer to committee would be in order. D. MacKinnon stated that there had been substantial discussion of the matter at the committee and that the decision to bring the motion forward to Senate had not been unanimous, but a strong majority of members did support the motion in principle, on the basis that if a student was admissible, they should be eligible for an award. D. Benoit pointed out that at research-intensive universities in Computer Science programs, all students get funding. Therefore, admitting students to whom an AGA cannot be offered puts Acadia at a competitive disadvantage. He would support this change, particularly since the AGA is a work award and not a scholarship. V. Zamlynny felt that lowering the standard, while not significant in practice, did send a poor message about our programs. C. Stanley considered the AGA as much an award to faculty members in his unit as to students. All students in his unit are fully funded, therefore the AGA award in some cases frees up research grant money for other uses. It was moved by S. Major, seconded by P. Williams that the matter be referred back to the Research and Graduate Studies Committee. K. Power wanted the committee to take into account all views from the affected departments. A. Foster suggested that, since the AGA is a work award, perhaps the monetary value of the award might be determined by the GPA. J. Whidden suggested that the committee should consider policies that raise the level

of acceptance and move toward a place where all students are funded. MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by W. Brackney that the motion c) on page 29 of the agenda be approved as circulated. D. MacKinnon spoke to the motion. When the current wording was drafted, it was assumed that all coursework for the program would be completed within 1 or 2 years of the beginning of the program. This is no longer the case, especially for part time students. As a result of the current wording, this extends the program for these students for a considerable time. C. Stanley wanted clarification as to why Social and Political Thought was different from other graduate programs in Arts. D. MacKinnon stated that Social and Political Thought was a two year program, while the others were one year programs.

MOTION CARRIED.

b) Notices of Motion re: Discrepancies
in Senate Membership

(APPENDIX O) D. Holmberg and B. Anderson drew the attention of Senators to the notices of motion that will provide clarity to Senate membership and rationalize the current lists of members.

c) Budget of the Academic Sector –
Acadia's Academic Priorities

T. Herman apologized for not being able to distribute the document earlier. As requested, the information is being made available near the beginning of the academic year and again at the end of the year. The same format is being used as last year, for ease of comparison. Any questions will be answered at the November meeting, after Senators have had time to review the information. J. Hennessy asked about the Deans' discretionary budgets. P. Williams pointed out that this amount includes the office budget, and that in Science and Professional Studies the Co-op offices are also included, as well as a technician for the Centre for Microstructural Analysis, and the chemical disposal budget. The TA budget in Science is primarily designated for labs, except in Mathematics and Statistics, where it includes marking weekly assignments. A. Smith asked S. Lochhead if the salary portion of the library budget included the University Librarian, other professional librarians, student assistants and staff. S. Lochhead confirmed that all except TAs were included in that figure.

J. Hennessy asked T. Herman about the non-salary amounts in the Deans' budgets. T. Herman will provide a breakdown for the next meeting.

8. Adjournment

On motion from J. Hennessy, the meeting adjourned at 5:58pm.

Rosemary Jotcham
Secretary to Senate

Timetable, Instruction Hours and Examinations Committee

Report to Senate for June 2012

The TIE Committee met electronically between November and December to discuss Calendar Dates. The dates received approval, by Senate, at the December meeting on December 12, 2011. There were no other issues brought to the TIE Committee during the 2011/2012 Academic Year.

It is the recommendation of the TIE (Timetable, Instruction Hours and Examinations) Committee that the Committee be disbanded and the duties of that Committee be the responsibility of the Registrar's Office. From the Registrar's Office perspective, we agree to assume the committee's responsibilities and that the Registrar will be available to act as a liaison to Senate regarding these issues wherever required. Therefore, the committee recommends that it cease to exist as a standing committee of Senate. There should be wide consultation with faculty to be sure that there is still input, but the consultation would be done differently via the Registrar's Office rather than through the committee structure.

ACADIA UNIVERSITY

Report of the SCHOLARSHIPS, PRIZES AND AWARDS COMMITTEE (SPAC) to SENATE for 2009-2010

REPORT DATE: May 16, 2012

SPAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Membership	July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010	July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011
Arts	Christian Thomas	Kerry Vincent
	Thomas Voss (Committee Chair)	Anna Saroli
	Julia Turner (Student Rep)	Christina Muehlberger (Student Rep)
Professional Studies	Scott Landry	Scott Landry
	Jun Yang	Igor Semenenko
	Robert McIntyre (Student Rep)	Emma Smith (Student Rep)
Pure & Applied Science	Michael Robertson	Michael Robertson
	Jeff Hooper	Jeff Hooper (Committee Chair)
	Emma Vaasjo (Student Rep)	Ashley Margeson (Student Rep)
Registrar or Delegate	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager of Scholarships and Financial Assistance	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager Scholarships and Financial Assistance
Financial Aid Counselor	Pamela D'Entremont (Committee Secretary)	Pamela D'Entremont (Secretary)

PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

1. To decide policy and process by which winners of scholarships, prizes, bursaries and awards are to be selected and to gather all information it considers necessary for the selection;
2. To select the winners of all undergraduate scholarships, prizes and awards;
3. To periodically investigate the scholarships, prizes and awards program and to recommend improvements (increased funds, new scholarships, more prizes, etc.) to those involved in the program;
4. To promote interest in the scholarship program by posters, letters and other means;
5. To consider such other matters as the Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

MEETINGS DATES

Five full committee meetings were held during 2009-2010 on the following dates:

November 6, 2009

November 16, 2009

March 9, 2010

April 1, 2010

May 26, 2010

Numerous other meetings were also held between the SPAC Chair, Secretary, and Manager of Scholarships & Financial Assistance to decide upon various awards and matters.

AGENDAS, DISCUSSIONS and CONCLUSIONS

The following represents the main agenda topics:

1. Acadia Excellence Scholarship Program

The Committee re-affirmed their commitment to the Acadia Excellence Scholarship program with the inclusion of renewable monies for each of the four scholarship tiers. The scholarship tier levels depend on the grades of the incoming students.

2. Entrance Scholarship Application Process

As high school ranks are increasingly difficult to obtain, it was decided that this was no longer required by the incoming student and the entrance scholarship files would be ranked by weighted average for review of the top 150 files by the Committee.

The Committee also reviewed the use of the information collected on the scholarship information form and endorsement forms and for what average tier levels the information would be required. Changes were made to the scholarship information form questions.

3. Student Access to Numeric Grades for Scholarship Renewability

The University conditions of renewability refer to numeric benchmarks but students have access to only gpa and letter grades. The University needs to move toward students being able to access their numeric grades for scholarship purposes.

4. Entrance Scholarship Offers

To be competitive with other universities, our top entrance scholarships have been named and valued as follows:

- Chancellor's Scholarships valued at \$10,000 renewable
- Board of Governor's Scholarships valued at \$7,500 renewable
- Nova Scotia High School Tuition Scholarships valued at \$6,652 renewable
- President's Scholarships valued at \$5,000 renewable
- International Baccalaureate Scholarships valued at \$3,000 renewable

5. Awarding of 2010 Entrance Scholarships

Acadia offered entrance scholarships to 879 students of the incoming class for September 2010. This included renewable entrance scholarship offers to students with high school averages above 80% and transfer student applicants (in their first undergraduate degree) to Acadia. The top three tiers included a value towards the cost of residence. The acceptance rate for 2010 was 44% with 379 accepting their entrance scholarships (approximately 1.1 M).

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont
Secretary

Jeff Hooper
Chair

ACADIA UNIVERSITY

Report of the SCHOLARSHIPS, PRIZES AND AWARDS COMMITTEE (SPAC) to SENATE for 2010-2011

REPORT DATE: May 16, 2012

SPAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Membership	July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011	July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012
Arts	Kerry Vincent	Stephen Ahern
	Anna Saroli	Anna Saroli
	Christina Muehlberger (Student Rep)	Emma Cochrane (Student Rep)
Professional Studies	Scott Landry	Scott Landry
	Igor Semenenko	Igor Semenenko
	Emma Smith (Student Rep)	Colin Deal (Student Rep)
Pure & Applied Science	Michael Robertson	Bryan van der Ende
	Jeff Hooper (Committee Chair)	Jeff Hooper (Committee Chair)
	Ashley Margeson (Student Rep)	Sarah Sweet (Student Rep)
Registrar or Delegate	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager of Scholarships and Financial Assistance	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager Scholarships and Financial Assistance
Financial Aid Counselor	Pamela D'Entremont (Committee Secretary)	Pamela D'Entremont (Secretary)

PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

1. To decide policy and process by which winners of scholarships, prizes, bursaries and awards are to be selected and to gather all information it considers necessary for the selection;
2. To select the winners of all undergraduate scholarships, prizes and awards;
3. To periodically investigate the scholarships, prizes and awards program and to recommend improvements (increased funds, new scholarships, more prizes, etc.) to those involved in the program;
4. To promote interest in the scholarship program by posters, letters and other means;
5. To consider such other matters as the Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

MEETINGS DATES

Three full committee meetings were held during 2010-2011 on the following dates:

December 3, 2010

March 25, 2011

March 31, 2011

Numerous other meetings were also held between the SPAC Chair, Secretary, and Manager of Scholarships & Financial Assistance to decide upon various awards and matters.

AGENDAS, DISCUSSIONS and CONCLUSIONS

The following represents the main agenda topics:

1. Acadia Excellence Scholarship Program

The Committee re-affirmed their commitment to the Acadia Excellence Scholarship program.

2. Entrance Scholarship Offers

To be competitive with other universities, our top entrance scholarships were valued as follows:

Chancellor's Scholarships valued at \$10,000 renewable

Board of Governor's Scholarships valued at \$8,000 renewable

President's Scholarships valued at \$7,000 renewable

International Baccalaureate Scholarships valued at \$6,500 renewable

Nova Scotia High School Tuition Scholarships valued at \$6,500 renewable

3. Awarding of 2011 Entrance Scholarships

Acadia offered entrance scholarships to 1388 students of the incoming class for September 2011. This included renewable entrance scholarship offers to all incoming students (in their first undergraduate degree) with an average above 80%. The acceptance rate for 2011 was 49% with 679 accepting their entrance scholarships (approximately 1.6 M).

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont
Secretary

Jeff Hooper
Chair

**Academic Technologies Committee
Annual Report to Senate**

Membership (2011-2012):

Dr. Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic.
Mr. Duane Currie, Coordinator of Academic Technologies.
Dr. Robert Pitter, Professional Studies.
Dr. Danny Silver, Pure and Applied Science.
Dr. Richard Cunningham, Arts.
Mr. Mike Beazley, Librarian.
Dr. Jeff Banks, Director of Open Acadia.
Mr. Paul Steele, Technology Services.
Mr. Colin Deal, Professional Studies Student Representative.
Ms. Emma Cochrane, Professional Studies Student Representative.
Ms. Sarah Sweet, Professional Studies Student Representative.
Chair: Duane Currie. **Secretary:** Jeff Banks.

The Academic Technologies Committee has met three times this past year on February 15, May 2, and June 1. During the year, a number of subgroups have met and worked on recommendations for the Committee.

The Committee has developed the following recommendations for Technology Services:

- that until such time as another option is available, a reminder should be sent to faculty about backing up using software supported by Technology Services.
- that a central backup method be implemented for part-time faculty.

The Committee recommends to Senate:

- that technology requirements be incorporated into course scheduling.

Other activities:

- A subgroup working on classroom technology has also provided recommendations to the committee on maintenance priorities for classroom technology, and acknowledgment that although docks may be convenient when available, laptops supporting docks are becoming rare.
- A subgroup on communications strategy has collected initial feedback on communication needs and preferences of a subset of faculty.

Respectfully submitted by the Chair,

Duane Currie
June 1, 2012

Annual Report to Senate from the Academic Integrity Committee

April 26, 2012

Committee Membership:

Patricia Rigg, Emma Cochrane, Robert Pitter, Martin Tango, Rosemary Jotcham

The Senate Academic Integrity Committee met on April 12, 2012. The Committee reviewed its mandate and outstanding items from previous meetings.

Submissions from unit heads regarding their approach to academic integrity had previously been received and reviewed. It was clear from these submissions that units have developed procedures to deal with academic misconduct that best fit their discipline.

The need for the Committee to continue was discussed by the members. It was felt that, although academic integrity is an important subject, the Committee itself may not be required.

The Registrar circulates information to faculty each fall reminding them to stress the importance of the issue and the consequences of academic misconduct to their students and to report any issues of misconduct that arise. The Registrar maintains the list of academic offenders. This information is not shared with the Committee for reasons of confidentiality, but a brief summary could be provided to Senate each year by the Registrar.

Any additional policy requirements related to academic integrity could be undertaken by the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee (Policy).

It was therefore suggested by the members that the Committee be dissolved.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Committee,
Rosemary Jotcham

Senate Archives Committee Annual Report (2011-2012)**Background:**

The Senate Archives Committee has been without a Chair and Secretary since 2009. As a result, the Committee has not met in the past three years. Although inactive, the Committee membership has continued to be filled with representatives from the student body, faculty, University administration, general research community, and Baptist community.

In 2011, discussions were held concerning the status of this Committee and the possibility of merging with the Senate Library Committee. At that time it was agreed that the Senate Archives Committee and the Senate Library Committee should remain separate.

Recommendations:

1. The Senate Archives Committee remain separate from the Senate Library Committee.
2. The Senate Archives Committee should be rejuvenated.

Report from the Faculty Development Committee.

1. Introduction.

The Faculty Development Committee was inactive for some time during 2009/10. Three faculty members were appointed to look broadly at the issue of faculty development and bring concise observations and recommendations to Senate. The Faculty Development Committee met on several occasions and respectively submit this report to Senate.

2. Faculty Development Committee Mandate.

The Faculty Development Committee was unclear of the precise mandate that the committee had and the specific areas of responsibility under its purview. Consequently the committee took a wide understanding of its role to include any and all areas that could be considered relevant to the development of members of Acadia University's four faculties (Arts, Science, Professional Studies & Theology). The committee excluded from its orbit of thought any person not appointed onto the faculty of Acadia University in a permanent contract, tenure track or tenured position. In doing so the committee also recognized that recommendations could also be applied to other teaching 'faculty' at the discretion of either Senate or the relevant Deans.

In particular our Justification for reviewing the FDC's mandate was prompted by the fact that the Senate Research Committee (SRC) duplicates the 'research' element of our mandate. The SRC is more widely representative of the university community and so is better equipped to handle issues directly relating to faculty research. Thus, the first recommendation of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) is that we request that the FDC's mandate be revised to exclude 'research'. This will allow us to focus more clearly on teaching development. The rationale being that quality of teaching and development of faculty teaching credentials as professional educators is core to the success of Acadia University and an expectation of students. The second recommendation is therefore that the mandate of this committee be altered to include to promotion of development of good pedagogical skills and qualifications within the university faculty as a priority area.

3. Development challenges.

The FDC discussed at length the nature of challenges and barriers to uptake to positive development of teaching skills within the university faculty. One immediate observation was that, with the exception of the Department of Education, it was not clear at all that many members of faculty had benefitted from being trained professionally as educators or teachers in their fields. This was noted as an observation that the committee would like the senate to be aware of together with the recognition that the role of professor and subject matter expert should be complimented by professional training in teaching.

The committee was also concerned to know some key facts that related to resources deemed by the committee as important to improving the opportunity to develop faculty.

These are:

- (a) What has been the effect of reducing the Learning Commons teaching on faculty development?
- (b) What was the take up in previous years on professional development offered through the university?
- (c) What are the replacement 'vehicles' for internal training?

The answers to these questions were not known and subject to further work by the committee as a means of shedding light upon the need to improve development of faculty.

The anecdotal evidence suggested that the Learning Commons played a significant part in offering options for educational development for faculty. The committee therefore decided that in order to fill at least some of the void created by the recent loss of the Learning Commons, the FDC undertakes to develop a series of workshops on teaching, where we draw on the strengths of existing faculty who have been identified as particularly good teachers, who use innovative pedagogical techniques, and/or make use of innovative technologies in the classroom. It is envisioned that these workshops will provide an opportunity for faculty to share ideas around best practice. To this end, we intend the workshops to be somewhat informal and dialogical, with each workshop to be followed by a social event to further strengthen conversations and collaboration around teaching at Acadia. Strengths of teaching expertise and innovation should be showcased to ALL members of faculty. This is the third recommendation.

4. Technology

In addition to the development of teaching skills the committee recognized that many students had a better grasp of technology and its application within the classroom than the member of faculty who was teaching. This was seen as a real concern and therefore the committee sees the development of faculty in use of technology within an educational environment as critical to professional competency.

In terms of technology training as a subset of best teaching practice we suggest the use of virtual communities, social media, blogs, ACORN, and integrating technology into teaching styles. The committee recommends that all faculty reach a minimum standard of operational knowledge in these areas.

5. Development through research.

In regards to Research the first question that the committee sought to answer was 'is this our area?'. If the answer is yes, then do we ask for research as part of professional development to be in areas likely to benefit the university and society rather than unconnected 'novelty' research? The committee seeks to take advice in this area from members of Senate.

SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT JUNE 18, 2012

Membership

May Abou Zahra (FA, attended the first meeting); Emma Cochrane (student representative); Leo Elshof (FPS); Rosemary Jotcham (Registrar); Chris Killacky (ADC); David McMullin (FPAS); Anne Quéma (FA); Rob Raeside (FPAS); Roxanne Seaman (FPS); Ann Smith (Library); Sarah Sweet (student representative for Kyle Power).

Mandate

The SCC reviewed curriculum submissions from the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science. For the benefit of new and returning members of the Committee, the first meeting began with a review of the mandate of the Committee as stipulated by Senate's Constitution. The mandate of the Committee is to recommend curriculum proposals for approval at Senate. In preparing these recommendations, the Committee members ensure that coherence and clarity are maintained while programs and courses are modified.

Process, comments, and two major issues

Generally, the SCC consulted with several schools and departments to address minor problems such as the need to clarify the terms of curriculum proposals, or the need to meet the 60 word requirement for course descriptions. In all cases, the objectives are to ensure that students have access to clear and accurate information, and that programs maintain descriptive coherence.

Comment # 1: While it is not the Committee's mandate, let alone power, to make economic recommendations, the Committee's members wish to note that, in some cases, modifications were made to the curriculum in response to faculty reduction and / or resource reduction.

Comment # 2: With regard to interdisciplinary minors in BSc and BScH, Emma Cochrane and the Committee note that some courses in the interdisciplinary minors require extensive prerequisites. Students need to be advised on this matter.

Comment # 3: The SCC has modified language in question 18.c in curriculum forms 1 and 3 so as to replace the reference to "library staff" with "liaison librarian for the program."

- A major issue concerned the decision of the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science to modify its language requirement. The proposal was to replace the required "6 h English or one language other than English" with "6h from the Faculty of Arts selected from the courses with a significant writing component as listed at www.science.acadiau.ca/sigwrtingcourseslist or 6 h of a single language other than English." The SCC invited Peter Williams, Patricia Rigg, Barry Moody, and Romira Worvill to a meeting where the proposal could be debated and clarified. To sum up, P. Williams described the consultation process in the FPAS that led to the formulation of the proposed change, and stated that the chief objectives are to ensure that Science students develop significant reading and writing skills, and that they have access to a variety of courses suiting their interests. These include English courses, language courses, but also other Arts courses with a significant writing component. B. Moody argued that the practical rationale for making this change is to address the backlog of students who need to fulfill this requirement. P. Rigg and R. Worvill underlined the benefits that students

derive from taking English and Languages courses (out of 24 students currently majoring in German, 7 are taking double majors in science). P. Rigg noted that first-year courses in English are capped for pedagogical reasons.

- At the end of January 2012, the members of the SCC had the opportunity to discuss Professor Zamlynny's proposal to add two questions to the curriculum form dealing with modifications to an existing course (1. Has the proposed modification been discussed with the course instructor? And 2. If yes, does the course instructor approve of the modification?). While appreciating the issue that Professor Zamlynny raised, the SCC decided not to sponsor his May 9, 2012. The motion of can be interpreted as reopening a process that will presumably have taken place within the department, the school, or the program. The proposal would indirectly redefine the SCC's mandate by ascribing to the Committee the capacity to function as an appeal body. Such a redefinition is not in the interest of faculty members.

Recommendations

The SCC recommended the adoption of the following resolutions:

1. That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Arts be approved.
2. That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Professional Studies be approved.
3. That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences be approved.

Furthermore, the SCC recommended that:

in the event of major interfaculty as well as interdisciplinary curriculum changes or innovations, a mechanism and structure be established that will ensure that proper consultation take place among Faculties.

Rationale: While the SCC recommends the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science's curriculum change for Senate's approval, its members are concerned that incomplete communication took place between the FPAS and the FA before the change to the language requirement was submitted to the SCC. It is also the view of the members of the Committee that the SCC is not currently mandated to monitor major interfaculty curriculum changes. The problem is as follows: in the case of curriculum changes affecting two programs, the SCC routinely invite members of the schools and departments concerned to discuss the proposals. However, in the case of major changes affecting two or more faculties, the SCC is not in a position to decide who should be selected to discuss an interfaculty curriculum change.

Outcome

The recommendation was split into two separate motions that were passed by Senate on May 9, 2012. The Academic Program Review Committee has been asked to propose to Senate a mechanism and structure fostering proper consultation among Faculties in the course of major interfaculty curriculum changes. Further, the APRC's forthcoming recommendations for the recently reviewed WGST program may serve as suggestions for the improvement of processes and structures in the context of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary programs.

ADMISSION & ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEE (Policy)

Annual Report to Senate for 2011-2012

August 30, 2012

Committee Members 2011-2012

Tom Herman (Chair)
Rosemary Jotcham (Secretary)
Peter Williams (Dean)
Barry Moody (Acting Dean)
Heather Hemming (Dean) (first term); Glyn Bissix (Acting Dean) (second term)
Jeff Banks (Acting Director)
Patricia Rigg
Christian Thomas (first term); Leigh Whaley (second term)
Ian Hutchinson
David Piper
Barbara Anderson
Paul Arnold
Bruce Fawcett
Kyle Power

Purpose of Committee:

To interpret and to apply the conditions of admissions and academic standing as outlined in the University Calendar and to make recommendations to Senate with respect to its policy as it relates to admissions, failures, and academic regulations.

Meeting:

There were no meetings of this committee held in 2011-12.

Respectfully submitted by the Chair,



Tom Herman
Vice-President Academic
Chair, Admission and Academic Standing Committee (Policy)

Board of Open Acadia
Annual Report to Senate for 2011-12

August 30, 2012

Board Members for 2011-2012:

Dr. Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic, Chair
Dr. Robert Perrins, Dean of Arts
Dr. Peter Williams, Acting Dean of Pure and Applied Science
Dr. Heather Hemming, Dean of Professional Studies
Ms. Rosemary Jotcham, Registrar
Ms. Mary MacVicar, Associate Vice-President Finance and Treasurer
Vacant, Student Representative
Dr. Jeffrey Banks, Acting Director of Open Acadia

The Board of Open Acadia did not meet over the 2011-12 academic year.

Open Acadia had a busy and successful completion to the 2011-2012 year. Online course offerings continued to grow, with 2011-2012 enrollment increases of 22% in online undergraduate courses and 15% in online graduate courses. Like many other institutions in Canada, we see this upward trend in online and blended learning continuing in 2012-2013, and beyond. Evidence for the competitive nature of online courses was seen by the fact that the number of exams proctored for other institutions more than doubled in the past year. Undergraduate and Graduate Intersession continued to be strong, with more than 80 undergraduate courses delivered this past year, and more than 40 courses in the Summer Institute for Graduate Education. Enrolment in the TESOL and French Proficiency programs also remained strong.

The growth experienced in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program last year has slowed due to a redirection of students from one geographic region by their Cultural Bureau. This, along with a targeted international recruiting strategy made possible by moving recruiting resources to Enrolment Services has allowed for a diversification of the EAP program. It is felt that this will make for more dynamic and enriched classroom environments for students and teachers alike as well as allowing for more sustainable growth in the future. The 3000 Bridging level (first piloted in 2009) continues to be a successful and rewarding experience for students. The percentage of students that graduate from this level remains between 70-80%, and more than 90% of these students continue on to degree programs in the Acadia credit program. Credit courses that are offered in the Bridging level continue to be taken from the Faculty of Arts, and the number of professors expressing interest in teaching these courses has increased. We now have a potential group of 6 or 7 professors who would be willing to teach for the EAP Bridging level – a great success for the EAP program.

Open Acadia continues to work closely with Schools and Departments to offer flexibility to our students via innovative programming options. The growth in online and distance delivery of

programs and courses has had a significant effect on our human resource capacity. Given the continuing growth in demand for delivery of programs to geographically dispersed students, we are actively researching online tools that will enhance the personalized education experience that our faculty can provide for students. The competitive nature of this area demands that we continue to keep pace with quality of Instructional Design within this space.

As our enrollment and programs expand, Client Service Staff continue to streamline processes to ensure our diverse learners receive the excellent service they have come to expect.

Other activities of OA and its partners that would be of interest to Senate include:

- The School of Education has started two new graduate Counselling cohorts for PEI (through an innovative collaboration with UPEI) and in the Cape Chignecto region of the province (in support of the CCRSB School Board). Other specialized cohorts are set to start this year for Music Educators (one cohort focusing on Elementary and another on Secondary), as well as for a cohort of educators wanting to focus on Creativity in Teaching.
- In collaboration with the School of Education and the Dalhousie College of Medical Education, the second M.Ed. cohort for Health Interprofessionals is set to begin in the fall of 2012.
- Open Acadia is also working with the School of Education, the Nova Scotia Department of Education, and multiple Academic Units within Acadia on a number of new Certificate Programs for NS teachers, including ones in support of teachers in Family Studies, Middle School Mathematics, and Computer Science.
- Our affiliations with the Dalhousie School of Nursing (Yarmouth Site), 14 Wing Greenwood, and the Class Afloat program also continue, with courses being offered through Open Acadia throughout the coming year.
- Acadia Lifelong Learning Centre - ALL continues to be a very important program, not only for Open Acadia, but also for the University. Our 2012-13 slate of courses are scheduled and the program will launch at the annual potluck event on August 29th, 2012. Based on an enthusiastic response to surveys, we are providing a slightly different array of courses this year, focusing on our members' suggestions, including more courses off-campus in an effort to reach out to members who do not live within Wolfville.
- Beijing Normal University - In July, 2012, Acadia hosted 28 students from Beijing Normal University – Zhuhai (BNUZ) for a 4 week program of English Language studies, Canadian culture classes, and facilitated field trips around Nova Scotia. This successful program marked the beginning of an important relationship between BNUZ and Acadia. The programming not only improved their English, but it also gave them the opportunity to immerse themselves in Acadia's true spirit of community and achievement. As a result of this program, at least five students applied and were offered admission to attend Acadia full-time in the 2012-13 academic year.
- Canadian Coast Guard College - The Department of Fisheries and Oceans renewed its \$212,000 contract with Open Acadia for delivery of the 2012-13 Physical Education program at the Canadian Coast Guard College in Sydney, NS. Classes began in September.
- Huggins High School Science Seminar - The 27th Annual Huggins High School Science Seminar was held on Friday, May 4th, with 70 high school students from around the

province in attendance. In 2012, the theme was "Dive Into Science", with presentations from Dr. Maia Hoeberechts of NEPTUNE Canada, Richard Zurawski, Dr. Michael Stokesbury, and Dr. Vlad Zamlynyy, and a very successful Lifeboat Debate.

Operationally, Open Acadia continues to manage program costs very well, and both undergraduate and graduate credit programs finished the fiscal year impressively, with increases over projected revenues and a good standing on year-over-year expenses. Open Acadia's net contribution to the University for 2011-12 continued to exceed previous years and grew in excess of %45 this year (surpassing budget expectation by %35). As always Open Acadia credits the quality and enthusiasm of its Academic partners for any success.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "T. Herman", followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Tom Herman, Ph.D.
Vice-President, Academic
Chair, Board of Open Acadia

ADMISSION & ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEE (Appeals)**Annual Report for 2011-2012**

September 21, 2012

Committee Members 2012-2012

T. Herman, Vice-President Academic
R. Jotcham, Registrar
R. Seale, Arts
S. Ahern, Arts
T. Weatherbee, Professional Studies
J. Guiney Yallop, Professional Studies
N. Clarke, Science
Y. Zhang, Science
H. Gardner, Theology
K. Power, Vice-President Academic (ASU)

Purpose of Committee:

- (1) To hear appeals against academic regulations or the interpretation of such regulations that have not been resolved at the Departmental, School, or Faculty level or through the Registrar's Office.

Business:

The Committee heard 43 cases for academic dismissal since the last report to Senate.

Thirty-seven of these were permitted to return to Acadia in a reduced course load (4 courses per semester) and were, in most cases, required to take the Academic Support Program.

Respectfully submitted by the Chair,



Tom Herman
Vice-President Academic
Chair, Admission and Academic Standing Committee (Appeals)

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Annual Report to Senate for 2011-2012

September 21, 2012

Committee Members 2011-2012

Dr. Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic (Chair)
 Ms. Rosemary Jotcham, Registrar (Secretary)
 Dr. Jeff Hennessy
 Dr. Deb Day
 Dr. Sonya Major
 Rev. Bryan Hagerman
 Deans of academic unit under review

Purpose of Committee:

- (1) To determine policy and procedures for conducting program reviews;
- (2) To determine annually which academic units are to be reviewed;
- (3) To select the members of each unit review committee;
- (4) To oversee the process of review in each case;
- (5) To make recommendations to Senate on the basis of the findings of each unit review committee
- (6) To deal with such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

Meeting Dates:

November 24, 2011; February 9, 2012; March 15, 2012; March 16, 2012; March 22, 2012; March 23, 2012;
 April 12, 2012; April 19, 2012; April 26, 2012; April 27, 2012; May 18, 2012; May 24, 2012; May 25, 2012; May
 28, 2012; May 30, 2012

Department	Status	Report to Senate
Biology	Review scheduled for Fall 2012	
E&ES	Review complete. APCR Recommendations to Senate.	June 2012
Math & Stats	Unit has met with APCR; awaiting written comments from Unit; APCR Recommendations to Senate pending	
School of Computer Science	Unit has met with APCR; APCR Recommendations to Senate pending.	
School of Engineering	Review Complete	June 2012
School of Music	Review scheduled for Winter 2013	
English & Theatre	Review Complete. Recommendations to Senate.	June 2012
Languages & Literatures	Review Complete. Recommendations to Senate.	June 2012
Philosophy	Review scheduled for Fall 2012	
Women's and Gender Studies	Review in progress. WGS Coordinator to meet with APCR	
School of Business	Unit has met with APCR; APCR recommendations to Senate pending	

Outstanding: Update of Senate-approved guidelines for Academic Program Review – Senate Executive recommended that the key priorities among the program review recommendations be addressed and this step has been incorporated into the guidelines for the Academic Program Review Committee's consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic
 Chair, Academic Program Review Committee

TO: Dr. Diane Holmberg, Chair of Senate
FROM: Academic Discipline Appeals Committee (2011/12)
SUBJECT: 2011/12 Annual Report to Senate
Date: September 28, 2012

The Academic Discipline Appeals Committee meets on as needed basis to deal with matters of academic discipline which cannot be resolved by the Vice-President (Academic). No such matters were brought to the attention of the Committee during the 2011/12 academic year, therefore no meetings were held.

Dr. Michael Dennis

Dr. Eva Curry

Prof. Paul Callaghan

Sarah Sweet

Colin Deal

DRAFT REPORT FROM ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE TO SENATE – MAY 9, 2012

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

The committee met on 16 occasions between September 15, 2011 and April 25, 2012. Agendas, minutes, relevant materials and collected data were placed on a Sharepoint site for the committee.

The first meeting was taken up with organizational issues, but the committee quickly identified the need to review the University Strategic Plan and conduct a “State of the Unit” survey. The committee also identified the need to gather “best practices” information from other universities. Discussion of the exact wording and format for the State of the Unit survey occupied much time over subsequent meetings.

At the October 27 meeting the committee passed four motions that determined its direction for the next series of meetings. First, a discussion of the APPC’s work was to be added to the agenda of the three Faculty Councils, (actions which did take place). Second, a discussion of the APPC was to be added to the agenda of the next Faculty meeting. Third, a university Town Hall meeting was to take place to discuss the APPC as well. The latter two actions were to have taken place *following* the results of the Unit Surveys, so discussions could be productively guided. Finally, the APPC agreed to generate a flow map and time-line of the current formal and informal planning processes at Acadia.

In early November the committee discussed the possibility of compiling an online survey on Academic Planning at Acadia and continued to work on the wording of the Unit Survey. The committee also decided at this time to present the draft version of the Unit Survey to the Faculty Councils.

Meetings of the committee through-out the fall term saw ongoing discussions over whether or not the committee should make recommendations, and if so, what form those recommendations should take (see the minutes of the meeting of December 8). These discussions continued into April. However, at the meeting of December 8, the Committee did agree that: 1) we had neither ruled in nor ruled out recommendations; 2) we would let the conversation go where it wants to go and; 3) if we did subsequently agree on a recommendation that it would be acceptable to make it in the report.

The State of the Unit survey was completed by the end of the year and distributed in January. It was at this time that the committee experienced a turnover in membership and difficulties in finding a meeting time that could accommodate all the new members.

Meetings in early 2012 focused on reviewing the Strategic Plan and compiling the Planning Flow Chart. By the time of the February 20 meeting, the committee co-chairs had received 22 responses to the Unit Survey. The Committee then formed five sub-committees to identify the themes arising from the survey responses. By the middle of April the Committee had compiled summaries of the survey responses, collected information of planning processes at other universities, completed the academic planning time line and flow charts.

At the April 25 meeting, the committee passed the following motion: “The APPC requests from Senate a one-month extension of its mandate in order to provide a set of options for academic planning at Acadia University”.

Additional materials, including the mandate of the committee and reports from subcommittees addressing a) the unit survey, b) existing Acadia academic planning processes and timelines, and c) scan of planning processes at other universities, are attached.

1. Mandate of Academic Planning and Priorities Committee -

This ad hoc committee shall serve at the pleasure of Senate, for a period not to exceed one year. The committee’s composition, mandate, and procedures shall be reviewed by Senate no later than the May 2012 Senate meeting, at which point the committee might be disbanded completely, continued in the same or modified form, or replaced with a standing committee.

Duties:

This committee’s goal shall be to gather and synthesize information relevant to identifying the ongoing academic goals and priorities of the University. In pursuit of this goal, the committee shall:

- (1) Consult widely with all relevant sectors
- (2) Foster discussions at all levels of the academic sector
- (3) Maintain channels of communication with Faculty Councils. For example, the committee might encourage units, faculties and interdisciplinary Programs to engage in self-studies to identify their short-term and long-term plans and priorities; it might facilitate discussion and sharing of information across units, faculties and Programs; it might conduct broad-scale surveys, town hall meetings, etc., to gather information and opinions from across campus.
- (4) Endeavor to provide relevant data to all those who need it to inform these discussions (e.g., financial information; enrolment information; information from other institutions; information from other committees, etc.).

Through its chairs, the committee shall report regularly to Senate on its procedures and its progress throughout the year, with the initial report on the procedures and mapping of how the committee will function to come to Senate no later than October 2011. Its goal shall be to begin to forge some consensus across the academic sector regarding where we are now, where we want to be in the future (e.g., five years from now), and how we can best get to where we want to be, given relevant constraints and opportunities.

2. Unit Surveys

Unit Survey Questions

- 1) The mission of Acadia University is “to provide a personalized and rigorous liberal education; promote a robust and respectful scholarly community; and inspire a diversity of students to become critical thinkers, lifelong learners, engaged citizens, and responsible global leaders.”
Please describe to what extent this mission is being fulfilled/supported by:
 - a) University
 - b) Administration
 - c) Your Faculty
 - d) Your Unit/Program

- 2) Does your unit/program use Acadia University’s current Strategic Plan?
 Yes No
If no, please explain why not.
If yes, explain the extent and ways in which the Strategic Plan influences your unit/program’s academic planning.
What are the shortcomings of the Strategic Plan?

- 3) What are the most important formal and informal academic planning processes for your unit/program?
 - a) Which aspects of the current academic planning processes work well for your unit/program?
 - b) Which aspects of the current academic planning processes do not work well for your unit/program?
 - c) What suggestions do you have that may enhance the planning processes at Acadia University?

- 4) Within the overall context of Acadia University, what are your unit/program’s most important academic goals and priorities (short-term and/or long-term)?
 - a) Staffing
 - b) Course offerings
 - c) Equity

- 5) What are the most significant challenges (resource-related and structural) that are currently facing your unit/program? In the event that your unit/program is experiencing particular challenges, please provide suggestions for improvement.

Identified Themes in the State of the Unit Responses

Each member of the committee reviewed the documents on their own, then the group met together to discuss and determine the themes. After a lengthy conversation the following themes and potential solutions were identified:

- 1) **Theme:** Need for guiding principles in all decision-making due to concerns that decisions are being made only from a financial point of view.
Implication(s): Determination of a set of guiding principles for the university to insure decisions are made in the best interest of the mission.
- 2) **Theme:** While most agree with the goals and overall message of the 2006 strategic plan, it is rarely consulted. There is a disconnect between the current reality and the plan.
Implication(s): Review and/or reaffirm the strategic plan. Insure that mission driven planning is taking place in the academic sector. Insure that plans for research, fundraising, technology, distance education, etc. are considered and incorporated.
- 3) **Theme:** Support for the current administration and Deans was evident, however there are still concerns regarding communications, assessment and transparency.
Implication(s): Improve mechanisms for communication between the levels (admin, deans, heads/directors, faculty, staff) and across faculties and sectors, including Open Acadia. Develop new models for communication: network vs. top down and bottom up. Increase the opportunities for communication for Heads/Directors, formal or informal.
- 4) **Theme:** Personalized education is being threatened. Much concern regarding the arbitrariness of Complement MOU in the CA.
Implication(s): Importance of communication and leadership at all levels.
- 5) **Theme:** Concerns that we are in survival mode, only “coping” rather than exercising thoughtful planning. Constant state of crisis.
Implication(s): Importance of communication and leadership at all levels. Emphasize the need for an overall plan.
- 6) **Theme:** Structural/Procedural inefficiencies or barriers: timetabling, technology limiting best practices (e.g. cross listing courses), use of FCE allocations, outdated rooms and labs, aging lab equipment.
Implication(s): Review of the internal processes.
- 7) **Theme:** Focus on excellence and student engagement. Importance of the autonomy of the units to deliver and adapt programs, contrasted with concerns about silo mentality and entrenchment.
Implication(s): Support and retain faculty, encourage dialogue.
- 8) **Theme:** Frustration with unit reviews, inability to implement recommendations, length of the process, accreditation requirements.

Implication(s): Revisit the process, look for efficiencies or improvements. Connect diagnostic elements of unit reviews to decision-making processes.

9) **Theme:** Lack of an administrative home, and support and direction for IDST.

Implication(s): Action to insure the sustainability and success of these programs.

10) **Theme:** Perceived lack of an overall plan, and of leadership/direction in how the institution moves forward.

Implication(s): A plan needs qualitative/non-financial indicators included.

3) Review of the current formal and informal planning processes at Acadia

The following summarizes our review and analysis of existing planning and related processes at Acadia. A summary set of flow charts and timeline is attached as Appendix 1.

a) **Observation/Findings:** Many of the internal processes used to manage the availability and deployment of resources needed for the execution of academic timetables are not effectively integrated or synchronized at an institutional level. For example, despite the potential for adverse impacts on faculty availability and timetabling of courses, the deadlines for application and consideration of Leave of Absence versus Sabbatical Applications are out of synch.

Conclusion: Given the importance of these processes, both for individual faculty and for collective academic planning, and the potential for adverse impacts on in-year planning, synchronization and/or integration of these two (and related) process would improve resource to task allocation for academic planning and timetabling purposes.

b) **Observation/Findings:** There are several external (e.g., stakeholder) and internal (e.g., budget, fundraising, etc.) processes which appear to interface with academic planning in what can only be described as an ad hoc fashion.

Conclusion: Given the interdependencies between resource availability/allocation to the academic sector with regard to the effectiveness of both in-year and forward academic planning, it is considered critical that:

- i) External processes be synchronized with internal processes wherever possible, and
- ii) The interdependencies of internal non-academic sector processes be integrated or synchronized with the academic sector planning processes.

c) **Observation/Findings:** The interface between regular semester planning/timetabling with Open Acadia intersession planning/timetabling processes is not currently synchronized with other supporting processes.

Conclusion: Given the interdependencies of these processes, and the significance of Open Acadia for student progression in particular faculties (e.g., science and business),

the current manner in which these are coordinated at the institutional level is considered sub-optimal and needs to be addressed.

- d) **Observation/Findings:** Many of the internal supporting processes (e.g., budgeting, physical infrastructure allocation) which impact academic planning do not appear to have been effectively coordinated at the institutional academic level.

Conclusion: Given the critical nature of these processes, in terms of how they enable or constrain academic timetabling/planning, informed, inclusive, and considered coordination is required to effectively support and enhance the academic sector.

- e) **Observation/Findings:** There is a lack of consensual understanding of academic planning processes across the institution.

Conclusion: Given the importance of these processes to the academic sector and the institution as a whole, a concerted effort must be made to ensure broad dissemination of academic planning processes across the institution as a whole.

4) Planning practices at other universities

The Committee conducted an informal survey of various academic institutions in both Canada and the USA to develop a sense of the type of planning processes that were in place at other institutions.

The survey is by no means comprehensive and we did not collect information on how well these processes were perceived to be working at their respective institutions. We were also mindful of the fact that there is a significant difference in the governance models between Canadian and US institutions.

Nevertheless, some common themes did emerge from our work:

- a) Of the (9 Canadian, 5 US) universities surveyed all had a planning committee.
- b) All have fairly broad representation from various sectors.
- c) Most Canadian institutions have the committee primarily as a Senate body, although McMaster is a notable exception.
- d) Some are more focused in the academic sector while some are more pan institutional.
- e) All universities state that they integrate their planning documents on a short and long term basis.
- f) Most universities state that they use their planning documents to evaluate themselves.

A detailed review of practices by institution is attached as Appendix 2.

Three motions from the Dean of Research & Graduate Studies, on behalf of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee:

- (a)** That the following restriction be placed on adjunct professors and other potential external thesis examiners:

An adjunct professor or other individual who has previously taught the student in a graduate level course, or who has been involved with the student's graduate-level research, cannot serve as an external reader for this student. This is also the case if they taught the student at the undergraduate level within the last four years. Furthermore, it is inappropriate to appoint an external reader who has worked in a collaborative research relationship or co-authored publications with the student's supervisor within the last two years. If these circumstances hold for an intended external examiner, the onus is on the supervisor to explain why this individual is the only reasonable choice. The final decision rests with the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, in consultation with the appropriate graduate coordinator (or unit head/director, where the graduate coordinator is the supervisor).

-
- (b)** That the following change of wording be adopted concerning Acadia Graduate Awards:

Former wording (Calendar)

In order to be eligible for an award, students must have a GPA not less than 3.00 in their major field in each of their last two years of undergraduate study

New wording

In order to be eligible for an award, students must have a GPA not less than 2.67 in their major field in each of their last two years of undergraduate study

-
- (c)** That the following change of wording be adopted concerning the time limits of curriculum for graduate students:

Former wording (not including the MEd):

All requirements for the degree must be completed within four years of completion of course requirements.

New wording (not including MEd):

All requirements for 2-year degree programs (all Science, Recreation Management, Social and Political Thought) must be completed within six years of first registration. All requirements for graduate degrees in Arts, not including Social and Political Thought, must be completed within five years of first registration.

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, Administration ~~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

1. 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.

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.**

1. 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.**