



Minutes of the Senate meeting of 8th May 2013.

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Wednesday 8th May, 2013 beginning at 9:00 a.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 26 present, increasing to 29 present a few minutes later.

1) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

The Chair noted that at that time she did not have a quorum, as 26 Senators were present. The Chair therefore requested that the order of business items be altered to allow 'announcements' to be dealt with first, since there was no obligation to vote on these.

The Chair noted regrets from J. Whidden, M. Rios, W. Brackney, N. Clarke, J. Holt, H. Kitchin, S. Lochhead; also noting that G. Phillips would be late.

The Chair welcomed L. Davidson, Assistant Registrar to the meeting, and welcomed C. Rushton.

b) From the President

President Ivany spoke of the tragic death of Sydney Taylor, an Acadia student who would have graduated on May 12th with a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Political Science. President Ivany explained that the group of students that had been vacationing with Sydney would be returning from Cancun that evening and stated that counsellors would be on hand. Senators were asked to remain vigilant over the Convocation weekend for any signs of difficulties being experienced by their graduates.

President Ivany discussed the U4 League media coverage last week and noted that there needed to be a better understanding of the space that a small group of universities such as Acadia and the three other institutions occupy in the Canadian post-secondary landscape.

President Ivany felt that the launch was generally well received by the media, but that there was a need in the future to flesh out what the strategic alliance meant. President Ivany noted that the Canadian landscape had altered and institutions like Acadia had suffered as a result.

President Ivany reminded Senate of the recent event held at Bishop's University when participants from all four institutions held a series of TEDx Talks focusing on undergraduate education. President Ivany noted that a second event had been held at Mt. Allison recently, which was a colloquium that explored the unique teaching and learning opportunities that students could experience at small, primarily undergraduate universities.

President Ivany stated that Acadia will host a session on the role of research and the undergraduate experience in the fall and that St. FX will be hosting a Student Leadership Forum in the late fall. This initiative represented a large quantum of headroom, and provided a starting point for the four independent

institutions.

The President pointed out that the starting premise for the U4 was the autonomy of the member institutions and their integrity as singular institutions. The point to be stressed was that these were four independent institutions and had been so for at least 175 years, and that they intended to continue in that way, at the same time looking at what could be done to enhance the space that the four occupied.

c) **From the Vice-President Academic**

T. Herman acknowledged the success of recent SSHRC grant applicants, noting that of the seven applications, three were successful. Of the remaining four applications, three were ranked by SSHRC as a '4a' which meant that they would have been fundable if funds had been available. T. Herman thanked D. MacKinnon for his efforts in mentoring individual faculty.

T. Herman described the recent announcement on campus regarding the 3.3 million dollar project from the Natural Resources Canada's ecoEnergy Innovation Initiative competition. T. Herman noted that although the project includes three Universities (Acadia, Dalhousie and University of New Brunswick) in addition to three industry partners: Fundy Tidal, Dynamic Systems Analysis and Clean Current, Richard Karsten from Acadia is the lead investigator.

T. Herman noted that this would be the last Senate meeting for R. Jotcham, as she was retiring shortly. T. Herman thanked R. Jotcham for her counsel, wisdom, foresight and positive approach through many years, and noted that the Registrar position was a difficult one that required sensitivity to the needs of many different individuals.

Senate warmly acknowledged R. Jotcham's contribution to Acadia.

Several Senators had arrived late and the meeting now had a quorum.

2) Approval of Agenda

The Chair noted that two hours was the normal time length for a Senate meeting, but that she would ask Senators to vote on staying later if the need arose.

Motion to approve the agenda moved by A. Smith, seconded by E. Callaghan.

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

MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA CARRIED.

3) Minutes of the Meeting of 8th April, 2013

Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 8th April as distributed. Moved by J. Hennessy, seconded by P. Hobson.

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

T. Herman requested that on Page 3, paragraph 5 the name Sabrina Hiefer be spelled correctly.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE REVISED MINUTES CARRIED.

4) Time-Sensitive Issues:

- a) Approval of the List of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2013
(previously circulated)

The Chair asked the Registrar whether there were any additions or changes to the list that had been circulated the previous evening.

R. Jotcham confirmed that there were no further additions or changes.

Motion that Senate approve the List of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2013. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by B. Moody.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Chair now requested the following enabling motion be read by T. Herman.

“Any candidate for an Acadia degree, diploma or certificate who should receive a grade or otherwise qualify or be disqualified between this Senate meeting and the forthcoming Convocation, shall be considered by the Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee, the appropriate Dean and the Registrar, acting as an ad hoc committee of Senate, they having the power to make consequential amendments to the graduation list.”

Moved by T. Herman, seconded by D. Benoit.

ENABLING MOTION APPROVED.

- b) Nominating Committee:
Senate vacancies *(attached)*

The Chair stated that J. Hennessy would speak to the report and that the Chair would then call for further nominations from the floor. The Chair noted that although she was nominated for one of the positions, Robert's rules did not expect her to step aside for this item. The Chair stated though that if anyone wished to nominate an additional candidate for the Chair, she would relinquish the Chair and leave the room for the vote to take place.

There were no objections to this approach.

J. Hennessy spoke to the report from the Nominating Committee and highlighted the challenge of not knowing from the Faculties who they were electing as their new Senators, at the time when the Nominating Committee was meeting.

The Chair noted that this report also served as the annual report of the Nominating Committee.

The Chair called three times for further nominations.

There being none, the candidates were elected by acclamation.

The Chair thanked Senators for agreeing to serve on Senate committees.

J. Hennessy stated that the Nominating Committee had received one nomination for a Lay Person to attend Senate. The Nominating committee

will be meeting to discuss and bringing a recommendation forward to the June meeting.

- c) Registrar: Nominees for the Nominating Committee (*attached*)

R. Jotcham highlighted the same difficulties expressed earlier, with regard to finding Senators from a very small pool.

The Chair called three times for further nominations.

There being none, G. Whitehall and A. Mitchell were elected by acclamation.

- 5) Carried Forward from Senate meeting of April 8th, 2013

The Chair reminded Senators that this motion was withdrawn last month, but that the 30 days' 'notice of motion' had now been met. The Chair explained what would happen if the motion passed, or failed. The Chair also reminded Senate that the APC had been asked to bring forward a process for Senate to consider at the June meeting.

- a) Motion from the Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee that the TTTCAC be disbanded(*attached*)

The Chair described a number of different options that existed if Senate decided not to vote on this motion until it knew what the proposed alternative was in June.

Motion from the Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation committee that the TTTCAC be disbanded. Moved by J. Hennessy, seconded by R. Murphy.

J. Hennessy acknowledged the concern by some that there should be a process in place first, prior to the TTTCAC being disbanded. J. Hennessy did not feel this to be essential and asked Senate to consider the motion before it, noting that the Heads and Directors had already endorsed the motion.

Motion that the vote be deferred to the June meeting of Senate. Moved by P. Hobson, seconded by S. Hewitt.

P. Hobson felt that initiation of the process was healthy. P. Hobson recognized that there was little prospect of tenure track appointments being made, but felt that it was still important to indicate where tenure track appointments were needed, and what the pressures were.

MOTION TO DEFER DEFEATED.

Senate now returned to discussion of the main motion.

MOTION CARRIED.

- b) Discussion of Senate Research Findings (*attached*)

The Chair provided a brief background on the research study from the University of Saskatchewan, noting that 13 Acadia Senators responded to the request for basic information. The Chair noted that five main themes were common to all Senates and invited Senators to provide feedback. It was noted that at the University Faculty Meeting, one of the faculty reps to the Board had described ways in which the Board had reviewed its own performance and had then put procedures in place to improve its performance. As a result, the Board felt that it was now functioning more effectively. The Chair asked if

Senate wanted to do something similar, in order to address similar concerns.

The Chair noted that the discussion could either continue until there were no more speakers, or that any Senator could move to limit the debate.

P. Williams asked whether the By Laws Committee was still discussing the Structure of Senate.

B. Anderson noted that the By Laws Committee was discussing Senate sub-committee structures only.

P. Williams asked whether the By Laws committee could start to discuss Senate structure.

The Chair stated that the committee could be asked to consider this.

B. Anderson stated that as a member of the By Laws committee she would take it under advisement but felt that this may not be the best place to start.

J. MacLeod asked how important this issue was to Senate. As there was a lack of response at the meeting, J. MacLeod wondered whether it made sense for the By Laws committee to do a lot of work on this.

S. MacDougall noted that she joined Senate three years ago with the feeling that substantial work needed to be carried out on the curriculum, because of the financial challenges facing the university. S. MacDougall noted that the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC) was initiated and then re-formed into the Academic Planning Committee (APC), and that despite the urgency of the issues, a period of three years had passed.

S. MacDougall felt that the Senior Administration was making progress, but that students were struggling to get the courses that they needed, and that Senate was responsible for leading and making decisions. S. MacDougall felt that there was a need for Senate to discuss its role and that the comments in the summary document were accurate.

S. MacDougall reflected that when reports came to the floor of Senate from Senate sub-committees, there was a tendency to pick them apart, instead of accepting and trusting the reports.

D. Benoit stated that a level of obstructionism was apparent, and felt that issues that seemed to be solved, consistently returned to Senate to be brought up again and again. D. Benoit also believed that sub-committee recommendations should be followed by Senate, instead of Senate micro-managing. D. Benoit had expected that Senate would provide some sober second thought to reports coming forward from sub-committees, but not that they would often refer issues back to the sub-committees.

E. Callaghan noted that she had only served on Senate for one year to date, and felt that if Senate were to do more research into consideration of this issue they would recognise that perhaps several months was not too long of a time frame for decisions to be reached on difficult issues. E. Callaghan questioned both what Senate is supposed to be doing, and whether Senate was doing what it was supposed to be doing.

J. Hennessy noted that time had been spent by Senate debating individual

words, but very little time was spent debating curriculum proposals. J. Hennessy pointed out that there was little scrutiny as to whether curriculum changes in a particular program were wise, or how the changes might affect resource allocation.

J. Guiney Yallop noted that this was his first year serving on Senate. J. Guiney Yallop felt Senate to be very democratic and thanked the Chair for the orientation session for new Senators, which he felt had set the tone. J. Guiney Yallop felt that if he served on a sub-committee, he would not feel offended if Senators questioned motions brought to the floor of Senate from that sub-committee. J. Guiney Yallop felt that the debate was healthy and that it was to be expected that Senate would struggle with reaching difficult decisions.

A. Smith also recognized that democracy was a time consuming process and felt that Senate should expect lengthy debate on the difficult issues. A. Smith found Senate to be a very democratic organization.

B. Anderson expressed a desire for Senate to monitor what it set out to do. Senate needed to record what it set out to do and take note of whether or not it was done. B. Anderson also raised the point that sub-committees did not always have complete clarity about what was expected of them, and that it was important to let sub-committees know what the expectations were before they started their deliberations.

S. MacDougall stated that she agreed with a certain amount of discussion and debate, but pointed out the example of a motion to formalize the use of Robert's Rules which took 20 minutes discussion of Senate.

P. Hobson stated that he had sat on many committees, including the Board of Governors. P. Hobson noted that debate was both healthy and essential. P. Hobson felt that without debate and without listening to those that were disagreeing, there was a tendency for decisions to be made that in the end proved to be damaging, and that it was important to listen to those voices of disagreement.

S. Major noted that several years ago a decision was taken to initiate a pilot program of Connections, which involved a great deal of Senate debate because departments felt threatened and were concerned. S. Major felt that this was one of the only times that Senate had been involved in a lot of curriculum-related debate.

B. Moody observed that he remembered Senate meetings in the 1990s where there was little or no debate taking place. Senate was now debating far more, which was a refreshing change. B. Moody had some concerns that Senate was reactive rather than proactive, and that no framework was currently in place to examine issues such as curriculum changes coming forward.

B. Moody felt that Senate should be asking difficult questions about who Senate was, and providing a leadership role in defining where the university was going. B. Moody felt that the curriculum had not been vastly altered in the last 100 years, but that surely much must have changed during that time.

B. Moody recognized that it was both inconvenient and uncomfortable to discuss and consider these issues at Senate, but that it was important to leave personal preferences at the door. B. Moody believed that if the discussion didn't take place on the floor of Senate, then it might not take place at all.

E. Callaghan stated that she was uneasy about the fact that departments were graduating their students, having taught them course content that would not necessarily serve them well into the future. E. Callaghan felt that it would be very good for Senate to have a discussion of that nature.

The Chair encouraged all Senators to bring suggestions and concerns forward.

6) New Business

- a) Motion that all academic policies approved by Senate be posted on the Senate website, for ease of access (*attached*)

Motion that all academic policies approved by Senate be posted on the Senate website, for ease of access. Moved by A. Smith, seconded by D. Benoit.

A. Smith noted that information on policies passed by Senate since 1999 was available on the Senate website within minutes or agendas, but was hard to find. A. Smith requested that a single site be identified for material relating to academic policies, to be stored on the Senate website.

S. Henderson asked whether all policies that were passed at Senate could be stored at one location.

P. Williams felt that there was some urgency to get this in place before R. Jotcham retired from Acadia.

The Chair stated that policies could and would be posted on the Senate website, if this motion passed.

S. Major asked about the faculty guidelines for examinations and R. Jotcham responded that these could all be found on the Registrar's website.

MOTION CARRIED.

- b) Senate Annual Reports (*attached*)

The Chair noted that Senate used to have a 'motion to receive reports' but that Robert's Rules said that this was not necessary. The Chair asked if there were any objections to dispensing with the motion to receive the reports.

There were no objections.

- i) Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning (*attached*)

S. Major highlighted the under-resourcing of staff and space dedicated to Disability Access Services, and noted that there had been a vast increase in the numbers of students that request support. S. Major noted that since 2006 the number of students seeking assistance had doubled from 135 to 270. S. Major stated that the move into the Fountain Commons for examinations had been an improvement and the committee urged the administration to use that space on a permanent basis for Disability Access Services.

- ii) Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation

J. Hennessy reported that the TTTCAC had been effective in discussing the demise of the committee during the year.

Committee
(TTTCAC)
(*attached*)

- iii) Timetable, Instruction and Examination Committee (TIE) (*attached*) R. Jotcham reminded Senate that members of this committee felt that it could be disbanded as the only item of business that it had handled during the year was the creation of the timetable of the list of calendar dates for the academic year. All other business was dealt with by the Registrar and her office.
- iv) Research Committee (*attached*) D. MacKinnon stated that the committee met on three occasions. Planning was carried out for the Industry and Community Partnership Day to celebrate research at Acadia, and a process was designed for engaging units and programs in a review of Acadia's Strategic Research Plan. D. MacKinnon noted that Tri-Council grant writing workshops would be offered again, and that on June 24th/25th as part of the U4 partnering initiative, a SSHRC knowledge creation and mobilization workshop was planned.
- v) Research Ethics Board (*attached*) D. MacKinnon reported on behalf of S. Maitzen (Chair) and noted that this committee met the first Tuesday of every month and adopted a very methodical approach to reviewing ethics applications.
- vi) Curriculum Committee (*attached*) R. Jotcham reported on behalf of A. Quema (Chair) that the Curriculum Committee met a number of times. R. Jotcham noted that the process is an awkward one because the committee was reluctant to question departments too much about their proposals. A lot of work was performed in a short period of time.
- vii) Graduate Studies Committee (*attached*) D. MacKinnon explained that there were no proposals for new Graduate Programs last year, so that the committee mostly carried out everyday business and housekeeping changes.
- S. Major asked whether discussions had been held about the role of doctoral programs at Acadia.
- D. MacKinnon responded that discussions had only taken place with regard to the Ph.D. Joint Program in Education two years ago, which operated independently.
- P. Hobson commented on the role of small undergraduate institutions and believed that many of the small undergraduate institutions that could have banded together with the U4 group of institutions, had gone ahead and introduced or expanded graduate programs. P. Hobson saw this as a trend that Acadia, and Senate could not ignore. P. Hobson asked where Acadia might fit with a university like Brock.
- P. Hobson believed that undergraduate programs were being used to subsidize graduate programs, and that this was an issue for the Graduate Studies Committee to consider.
- D. MacKinnon agreed that proliferation of graduate programs had occurred, especially in Ontario. D. MacKinnon felt that graduate studies was exceptionally important in a small university, but that it was not so much the

number of programs that could be offered, more the strength of any one program that needed to be ensured. Acadia was challenged when only a couple of students were involved in a graduate program. In some departments, graduate teaching was on-load, while in others it was off-load.

S. Major stated that faculty teaching graduate courses on load could potentially have a huge impact on the undergraduate programs.

viii) Awards
Committee
(attached)

H. Gardner reported that excellent meetings had been held and that the committee members worked well together. The committee wanted to clarify the nominating procedures, since a number of people had been nominated and approved by Senate to receive Honorary degrees, but had not yet received the degree. Some had actually passed away during the wait. H. Gardner noted that this year there were new nominations, but that the committee was also working through the list of people previously nominated. H. Gardner stressed that it was important that the names be kept confidential.

ix) Archives
Committee
(attached) *Motion
that Senate adopt
the attached
schedule and
procedure for
archiving Senate
materials*

A. Smith reported that the Archives Committee had met three times during the year, and was offering the following motion.

Motion that Senate adopt the attached schedule and procedure for archiving Senate materials. Moved by A. Smith, seconded by P. Williams.

The Chair noted that the Senate Constitution did state that all Senate and Senate sub-committee minutes should be archived. The Chair explained that until a decade ago, Senate minutes and other records were archived, but that now this material only existed on the website. The Chair noted that there are also some gaps in the record keeping. There were concerns about having material only on the web, because technology changes and altering formats could result in stored material not being available in later years.

The Chair stated that a plan was in place to archive future minutes of Senate meetings, and also minutes from Senate sub-committee meetings. On a going forward basis, sub-committees would be asked to forward minutes to the Archives department at the end of each academic year. Sub-committee Chairs were asked to send any material in whatever format that they were currently maintaining. There was also a request in place to the VP Academic's office for modest funds to allow proper archiving of Senate materials from the past decade.

MOTION CARRIED.

x, xi and xii)
Academic Integrity
Committee,
Academic
Discipline Appeals
Committee and
Faculty
Development
Committee

The Chair noted that the following three sub-committees had not met during the last year:

- Academic Integrity Committee
- Academic Discipline Appeals Committee
- Faculty Development Committee.

S. Major stated that the Faculty Development Committee ought to be meeting because that committee was supposed to put forward the names of faculty to be considered for awards such as the 3M and the AAAU Teaching Award. S. Major noted that this was now being done in a very ad hoc manner.

The Chair stated that in the last report that came through from the Faculty Development Committee, it had been noted that with the disbanding of the Learning Commons, there was no longer any mechanism in place for teaching development and issues around pedagogy. The Chair agreed that there were also other areas that the committee could be discussing, such as mental health issues amongst the students on campus.

T. Herman stated that he met with the Deans on a weekly basis and that they were keen to mentor and work with any faculty whose names were going forward for consideration for awards, because it was not just a question of putting forward nominations for awards; there was a need to develop those nominations and mentor and assist the individuals with their applications for special awards.

7) Adjournment

The Chair called for a motion to adjourn at 10:40 a.m. Moved by J. Hennessy.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Senate Nominating Committee 2013 Annual Report to Senate

Membership

R. Seale (Arts)
J. Hennessy (Arts Senator)
A. Parsons (Science)
A. Mitchell (Science Senator)
D. Piper (Prof. Studies)
I. Hutchinson (Prof. Studies Senator)
Chair: J. Hennessy

Duties

- (1) to nominate for the April meeting of Senate the Chairperson and Deputy Chair of Senate, for election by Senate in May, to take office the following July;
- (2) to nominate for the May meeting of Senate, to be elected by Senate and take office in July:
 - a) candidates to fill the non-*ex officio* positions on the Executive Committee of Senate;
 - b) candidates to fill annual vacancies designated for the Senate on ad hoc and standing committees of Senate;
 - c) the Chairperson of the Senate Library Committee;
 - d) lay persons to be members of Senate;
 - e) a person to fill the office of Faculty Elections Officer
- (3) to act upon such other matters as may from time-to-time be referred to it by Senate;
- (4) in extraordinary circumstances dictated by time constraints, the Nominating Committee will recommend to the Executive Committee of Senate, the name(s) of a Senator(s) to specific-Senate and/or other University Committees.

Activity

The committee performed its duties mainly via email, and had one meeting on April 25, 2013 to approve the list of candidates for vacant positions for the May meeting of Senate. The Committee also elected **Ashley Parsons** to serve as Chair for the 2013-14 academic year.

The committee also noted that the normal difficulty in finding nominees to fill committee vacancies is often confounded by the fact that elections for new faculty senators are usually not completed by the May meeting of Senate, thereby reducing the pool of eligible senators.

Nominations for Vacant Positions

Chair of Senate (1 year)
Diane Holmberg

Deputy Chair of Senate (1 year)
Stephen Henderson

Faculty Elections Officer (1 year)
John Guiney Yallop

Senate Executive (1 year)
Arts: *Geoffrey Whitehall*
Science: *Andrew Mitchell*
Prof. Studies: *Edith Callaghan*

Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning
Arts (3 years): *Christianne Rushton*
Prof. Studies (1 year): *Lynn Aylward*

Lay Person on Senate
TBA

Theology Replacement on By-Laws Committee
TBA after May Theology elections

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffrey J. Hennessy, Ph.D.
Chair
Senate Nominating Committee

Office of the Registrar



April 26, 2013

I wish to nominate the following two Senators to serve on the Senate Nominating Committee:

- from the Faculty of Arts: Dr. Geoffrey Whitehall
- from the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science: Dr. Andrew Mitchell

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Rosemary Jotcham".

Rosemary Jotcham
Registrar and Secretary to Senate

Attachment 5)a)
Senate Agenda 8 May 2013

Motion from the Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee:

- 1) That the Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee be disbanded.

Brief Summary: Canadian University Senates Project

(for details, see *“Canadian University Senates Project: A Summary for Acadia University*, by Pennock, L., Jones, G. A., Leclerc, J. M., & Li, Sh. X. (2013), as circulated to Senate)

This research project on Senates across Canada summarized its main findings as centring around five common themes. Some of these themes have also arisen in discussion at Senate over the last few years:

1. Questions regarding the effectiveness of Senate’s oversight of program quality, teaching, and learning. (*“...the importance of senates’ focusing on the ‘big picture’ ... and not simply being distracted by the details of things like course approvals”*)
2. Questions surrounding Senate’s relevance (or lack thereof), effectiveness, and power, especially in financial matters. (*“... a sense that senates lack relevance or power ... a real hunger on the part of respondents for lively, meaningful debate on meaningful issues”*)
3. Role confusion and power imbalance/struggle between Senate and Board/administration (*“...frustration that the senate’s authority over academic matters is weakened by its lack of power or influence over financial matters...few opportunities for the board and senate to connect in any meaningful way... perception that boards of governors being a corporate agenda to the academy.”*)
4. Need to get faculty members engaged and involved in collegial self-governance. (*“... the challenge of engaging potential senate members ... and for the senate itself to become more engaged in carrying out its governance role and responsibilities. Factors such as apathy, poor communication about the importance of collegial self-governance, and workload pressures...”*)
5. Need for constitutional change and reform. (*“...comments related to the size of the governing body... diversifying or rebalancing the membership ... need to clarify reporting and authority relationships between [senate and individual faculty councils]...”*)

The study also provided average data across all institutions, and data for Acadia’s Senate. The results for Acadia are based on a small sample. Nevertheless, here are a few notable trends where we seemed to differ from the average:

- A. “I know the organizational structure of the university.” Avg Agree: 88%; Acadia: 55%
- B. “I believe processes are in place to assure our senate that the academic quality of our university is maintained.” Avg Agree: 62%; Acadia 45%
- C. “I believe that it is difficult for our senate to make decisions involving significant change.” Avg Agree: 62%; Acadia 100%
- D. “The size of our senate acts as a barrier to effective decision making.” Avg Agree: 29%; Acadia 73%

- E. "I believe our senate should have more autonomy from our university's governing board." Avg Agree: 42%; Acadia 18%

And here are a few statements where what we should do and actually do don't seem to mesh:

- F. "Senate should/does periodically review its own performance." Acadia: 100% "should"; 18% "does"
- G. "Senate should/does play a role in determining the future direction of the university." Acadia: 100% "should"; 18% "does"

Question: Should we do anything to address some of these concerns; if so, what?

a) **Motion from Ann Smith:**

All academic policies approved by Senate be posted on the Senate website, for ease of access.

Report of Senate Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning (2012-2013)
May 2013 meeting of Senate

Members:

Carol Anne Janzen (DC, Chair Jan-present)
Sonya Major (FPAS)
Christianne Rushton (FA, Jan – May 2013)
Mike Corbett (FPS, May-Dec, 2012)
Lynn Aylward (FPS, Jan-May, 2013)
Janice Best (FA, chair May-Dec, 2012)
Kathy O'Rourke (Disability Resource Facilitator)
Jill Davies (Counsellor, Disability Access)
Rosemary Jotcham (Registrar)
Emma Cochrane (student representative)

The Senate Committee on Students with Disabilities that Affect Learning met six times this year (September 19, October 24, December 5, February 27, March 20 and April 17). At the December meeting, Carol Anne Janzen was elected chair to replace Janice Best who was leaving on sabbatical. On January 1, Christianne Rushton agreed to take Janice Best's position as Arts representative and Lynn Aylward replaced Mike Corbett, also on sabbatical, from Professional Studies.

The highlights of the committee's work this year:

- **A panel on Reasonable Accommodations was held on October 3**, chaired by committee member Sonya Major, and featuring seven panelists including students, faculty, service providers and professionals in the field of post-secondary disability services. The panel was well attended and received by a cross-section of faculty, staff and students. The committee has decided to make similar panels an annual event and has selected Mental Health as the focus for fall 2013.
- **There has been a 35% increase in the number of students** registered with Disability Access, from the 2011/2012 year to the 2012/2013 year (204 to 275 students). It is increasingly difficult for the two staff members, Counsellor, Jill Davies, and Disability Resource Facilitator, Kathy O'Rourke, to meet students' needs. The committee met in November with Acadia's three VPs to outline the situation and request another staff person and larger facilities. As of now, no permanent solutions have been forthcoming.
- **Final exams were moved to the Fountain Commons** in December (353 exams) and, following good feedback from students, were offered there again this April (337 exams). Kathy O'Rourke, who oversees exam accommodations, is strongly in favour of the Fountain Commons becoming our permanent location and there is strong support on the part of the senate committee as well as the students to advance a permanent move.

- **Jill Davies reported that since January**, bi-weekly meetings between herself, Kathy O'Rourke, James Sanford, and Terry Lane have been held in an attempt to respond to the concerns about increasing numbers in Disability Access, the urgent need for a new space for exam accommodations, and the imminent retirement of Terry Lane and Jill Davies, summer 2014.
- **Software is being designed** to streamline the process of exam requests and accommodations. Due to the rising demand for exam accommodations, there have been corresponding increases in the scope of required support services. Certain technological innovations can streamline the administrative tasks that disproportionately occupy personnel. Recognizing no "off-the-shelf" solution exists, Disability Access has invested in the development of a digital solution to provide secure and central access for students and staff in managing exam accommodations, tutoring, and other critical support services. John Frost, one of the developers, will be presenting his research to date at the Canadian Association of College and University Student Services (CACUSS) conference at McGill in June 2013.

TTTCAC SENATE REPORT MAY 8, 2013

This is a report on the TTTCAC's activities since November 2012.

MEMBERSHIP

- 1 Dean of Arts: B. Moody (Acting) ex-officio
- 1 Dean of P&A Sc.: P. Williams ex-officio
- 1 Dean of Prof. St.: H. Hemming ex-officio
- 1 Senator / Chair: A. Quéma
- 1 Arts (Tenured Faculty): J. Hennessy 1July12~30Jun13
- 1 Arts alternate (Tenured Faculty): L. Whaley 3 yr 2015
- 1 Prof. St. (Tenured Faculty): R. Murphy 3 yr 2015
- 1 Prof. St. alternate (Tenured Faculty): Vacant 3 yr* 2013
- 1 Science (Tenured Faculty): J. Banks 1July12~30Jun12
- 1 Science alternate (Tenured Faculty): R. Raeside 3 yr 2014

CONTEXT

- In June 2012, Senate approved the motion that the By-Law describing the mandate and operating procedure of the TTTCAC be revised. The terms of the motion (moved by D. Kruisselbrink and seconded by R. Murphy) were as follows:
 1. The TTTCAC shall gather relevant data from the Registrar and circulate it to Deans, Directors, Heads and program coordinators, on an annual basis, by May 31.
 2. Units shall submit position requests to the Chair of the TTTCAC, and copied to the relevant Dean "*and the Vice-President Academic*"[DB], along with a one/two line rationale justified by demonstrated need, by June 15.
 3. If the Vice-President Academic has notified the Chair of the TTTCAC, by June 30 of a given year, that tenure-track searches will be authorized:
 - a. Units shall complete a formal request which shall be submitted to Dean of their faculty.
 - b. Each faculty shall submit a ranked list to the Chair of the TTTCAC by September 1.
 - c. The TTTCAC shall complete its ranking process and submit the ranked list to the Vice-President Academic by September 15.
 4. If the Vice-President Academic has notified the Chair of the TTTCAC, by June 30 of a given year, that tenure-track searches will not be authorized:
 - a. The TTTCAC will report the list of requests to Senate at its September meeting.
- On the recommendation of Diane Holmberg, Chair of Senate, a second motion was carried that "Senate approve a temporary exception to the By-Laws to enable the TTTCAC to follow the new

procedures while the TTTCAC consults with the By-Laws Committee regarding the required changes to the By-Laws” (moved by R. Murphy, seconded by B. Anderson).

ACTIVITIES

- November 13: the Chair worded revisions of the mandate as requested by Senate, and circulated them by email to the members of the Committee.
- November 26: the Committee reached a consensus on the revised wording. However, a member of the Committee also proposed a different approach to the ranking process.
- December 14: the Committee met to discuss this first new proposal. In the course of the discussion, a second proposal emerged. The outcome of this meeting was that the Deans would consult their respective faculties to discuss the second ranking proposal.
- December 18: the Chair circulated the minutes of the meeting to the Committee.
- January 31 2013: P. Dimock provided the data from the Registrar’s Office.
- February 11: the Chair submitted a mid-term report to Senate
- March 14: The Committee met to discuss the outcome of the process of consultation between the Deans and the directors and chairs. On the basis of that discussion, it was agreed that two motions would be submitted to Senate at the April meeting. Jeff Hennessy prepared the motions and, after discussion and amendment, the Chair sent the motions as agenda items. At Senate, J. Hennessy spoke to the motions, and A. Quéma further contextualized them. The motions and their rationale read as follows:

TTTCAC Motion

During the annual review process for the Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee, it was revealed that there is widespread concern across campus regarding the nature and function of this committee. The Deans were therefore tasked with initiating a discussion of the issues with the Heads and Directors from each faculty and to report back to the committee. Following this consultation, the TTTCAC proposes the following two motions to senate.

- 1) That the Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee be disbanded.
 - 2) That the Academic Planning Committee be charged with recommending to Senate a new process that links the allocation of tenure track faculty to academic planning. In doing so, the TTTCAC urges the APC to preserve consultation with faculties and academic units as part of the new allocation process.
- April 8: motion 1 was withdrawn; motion 2 was carried. The next step has been to re-introduce motion 1 for debate at the May 2013 meeting.

Anne Quéma
Chair of the TTTCAC

TIE Committee Report to Senate for May 2013

The TIE Committee met electronically between November and January to discuss Calendar Dates. The dates received approval, by Senate, at the February meeting on February 11th, 2012. There were no other issues brought to the TIE Committee during the 2011/2012 Academic Year.

**Senate Research Committee
Annual Report to Senate
May 2013**

Committee members:

Boddie, S. (Arts)	MacKinnon, D. (RGS; Chair)
Brackney, W. (Theology)	Pufahl, P. (Pure & Applied Science)
Cochrane, E. (undergraduate student)	Redden, A. (Research centre director)
Colton, J. (Professional Studies)	Robicheau, W. (Library)
Dueck, N. (graduate student)	Trofanenko, B. (Canada Research Chair)

The Senate Research Committee met on three occasions: 22 October, 29 October, and 27 November. The work of the Committee was focused primarily in two areas:

- Planning for the Industry and Community Partnership Day, held on 16 November
- Designing the process for engaging academic units and programs in a review of Acadia's Strategic Research Plan

Industry and Community Partnership Day

The Senate Research Committee and the Division of Research & Graduate Studies hosted a one-day celebration and exposition of research at Acadia, with a particular lens this year on collaborations and partnerships between Acadia faculty members and students, and industry and community groups.

The day included 13 interactive research displays by students and faculty on the main and lower levels in the K. C. Irving Environmental Science Centre throughout the day, as well as displays on the lower level by industry and community sponsors. In addition, panel discussions were conducted in four theme areas: agri-food/wine, equity and diversity, health and wellness, and tidal energy. Panel discussions were taped by Eastlink.

Over 110 people signed the guest book, and many more than that attended. The day concluded with a special presentation by Dr. Irene Penesis from the Australian Maritime College at the University of Tasmania.

Strategic Research Plan

A modified process for the review of the Strategic Research Plan was developed and approved by Senate. The open and transparent process includes (a) meetings by the Dean of Research & Graduate Studies with all department heads, school directors, and program coordinators to discuss research cultures; (b) unit and program engagement with structured questions focusing on research strengths, research connections, strength building, and perceived utility of the current SRP; (c) focus group discussions of preliminary analyses of unit and program submissions; (d) the development of a

preliminary draft for campus distribution and an open forum discussion; and (e) a final draft submission to Senate in the fall of 2013.

Mentoring Workshops

Research and Graduate Studies and the Senate Research Committee will once again be offering Tri-Council grant writing workshops, tentatively scheduled for May 27th, June 10th, and June 21st. In addition, a specially SSHRC knowledge creation and mobilization workshop is tentatively planned for June 24th and 25th, sponsored jointly by Acadia University, Mount Saint Vincent University (host institution), St. Mary's University, St. Francis Xavier University, and Cape Breton University.

Respectfully submitted,

David MacKinnon
Chair, Senate Research Committee

To: Acadia University Senate
From: S. Maitzen, Chair, Research Ethics Board
Date: 30 April 2013
Re: **Annual Report of the Research Ethics Board**
For the period 1 May 2012 to 30 April 2013:

REB members

Dr. Joan Boutilier, Community Member
Dr. David F. Duke, Faculty Representative, Arts
Ms. Anita Hudak, Community Member
Dr. David MacKinnon, Dean, Research and Graduate Studies (*ex officio*)*
Dr. Stephen Maitzen, Chair
Dr. Susan Potter, Faculty Representative, Pure and Applied Science
Dr. Anna Robbins, Faculty Representative, Theology (from 11 September 2012)**
Dr. Christopher Shields, Faculty Representative, Professional Studies (from 1 July 2012)
Ms. Crystal Sweeney, Graduate Student Representative*
Dr. Brenda Trofanenko, Faculty Representative, Professional Studies (to 30 June 2012)

* Non-voting

** No Representative from Theology served during the period 1 May to 10 September 2012.

Applications and meetings: During the reporting period, the REB reviewed 83 new formal applications for ethics approval, as well as numerous formal requests from researchers to approve changes to previously approved research. The REB met on 11 occasions during this period.

Other activities: The REB's Chair and Faculty Representatives responded to numerous informal inquiries from student and faculty researchers at Acadia and elsewhere. The Chair serves as the University's liaison to the national Secretariat for Research Ethics, prepares and distributes the agendas for meetings, records the minutes at meetings and distributes them for approval, writes letters of ethics approval or rejection, performs all filing and maintenance of records, follows up on unapproved research, reviews annual reports from department-level ethics committees, publicizes the role and requirements of the REB, maintains the REB website, and prepares reports for Senate and other bodies concerning the business of the REB.

Training of members: Each newly appointed REB member receives a detailed written orientation from the REB Chair describing the new member's duties and the REB's procedures.

Ad hoc advisors: Ad hoc advisors are appointed only when the REB judges that it lacks the knowledge needed to review a particular application. None were required during the reporting period.

Appeals: None

Complaints: None

Guidance sought from the Canadian Secretariat on Research Ethics: None

Matters out of the ordinary: None

Other comments: None

SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT MAY 8, 2013

Membership

Leo Elshof (FPS); Jeff Hooper (FPAS); Rosemary Jotcham (Registrar); Chris Killacky (ADC); David McMullin (FPAS); Anne Quéma (FA); Alex Rice (student representative); Roxanne Seaman (FPS); Pat Townsend (Library); Kyle Power (ASU VP Academic); Romira Worvill (FA).

Mandate

- a. To consider recommendations from any Faculty, Department or School for changes in its degree, certificate, or diploma regulations and make recommendations to Senate;
- b. To initiate and make recommendations concerning changes in the curriculum; in particular, to make recommendations concerning the requirements for any degree;
- c. To consider curriculum changes which may be made necessary by changes in secondary school matriculation standards;
- d. To consider submissions from all Departments, Schools, or from any individual, concerning changes in the curriculum;
- e. To consider such other matters as Senate may entrust to the Committee.

Process

The SCC met on December 7 and 12, 2013 to consider and analyze curriculum proposals 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.

On the basis of the Committee members' analyses, the chair consulted with school directors and departmental chairs to address various problems such as the need to clarify the terms of program and course descriptions. In all cases, the objectives were to ensure that students have access to clear and accurate information, and that programs maintain descriptive coherence.

Once clarifications and modifications were reported to the Committee by the chair, the Committee recommended the revised proposals for approval. Then, the Registrar and the chair collated and proofread all the submissions.

The SCC recommended approval of the curriculum proposals at the Senate meeting of 11 February 2013.

Action item

To assist faculty members in preparing curriculum proposals, Dr. Romira Worvill suggested that the SCC could issue guidelines. The Committee supported this initiative. Dr. Worvill has offered to prepare this document on which the SCC will deliberate. The objective is to make this document available to all faculty members for the next round of curriculum changes.

Anne Quéma
Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee

**Senate Committee on Graduate Studies
Annual Report to Senate
May, 2013**

Committee members:

Aylward, L. (Educational Studies)	Kitchin, H. (Sociology)
Barr, S. (Geology)	MacDonald, D. (graduate student, Theology)
Biro, A. (Social & Political Thought)	MacKinnon, D. (R&GS; chair)
Brackney, W. (Theology)	McFarland, S. (Chemistry)
Brickner, R. (Politics)	Mendivil, F. (Mathematics & Statistics)
Colton, J. (Recreation Management)	Quinn, D. (graduate student, FPAS)
Corbett, M. / Lehr, R. (Education)	Spooner, I. (Applied Geomatics)
Dueck, N, (graduate student, Arts)	Horvath, P. (Psychology)
Evans, R. (Biology)	Trudel, A. (Computer Science)
Fullerton, M. (graduate student, FPS)	Whetter, K. (English)

Business:

The Senate Committee on Graduate Studies met on two occasions during the 2012-2013 academic year: 18 September and 26 February (coordinators only; AGA awards). Regular (non-problematic) business was conducted electronically throughout the year. As there was little this year in the way of curriculum changes, policy initiatives, or new program discussions, the Committee was able to conduct most of its regular business on-line.

The business that came before the Committee this year included the following:

- *Curriculum changes.* Curriculum changes and program modifications to graduate programs in Biology and Education.
- *Subcommittees.* Establishment of awards subcommittees for SSHRC, Governor-General's Gold Medal, NSHRF
- *Graduate supervision.* Discussion of the new policy document on graduate supervision.
- *GPA for AGA awards.* A recommendation from the Committee to Senate to change the GPA requirement for receiving an Acadia Graduate Award from 3.0 to match the GPA entrance requirement of 2.67. This was subsequently rejected by Senate. The requirement remains 3.0 and the Committee will revisit the requirement in the fall, at Senate's request.
- *Time limits of curriculum.* A recommendation to change the wording in the Calendar regarding the Time Limits of Curriculum to read: "All requirements for Science and MR degrees, as well as the MA in SOPT must be completed within 6 years of first registration.

All requirements for the MA in ENGL, POLS, and SOCI must be completed within 5 years of first registration.” This was passed by Senate.

- *External readers.* Discussion of the necessity of obtaining written comments from external thesis readers prior to a defense. The discussion originated due to the frequent difficulties of receiving comments. However, the Committee felt it was still a valuable part of the process, and so it will remain part of operating procedure.
- *Admissions.* The Committee discussed the time necessary for providing feedback to graduate applicants, in an attempt to ensure that this happens as soon as possible. The challenge is that some departments/schools do not make admission decisions until all external funding is known. It was agreed that departments/schools would provide feedback to applicants on their applications. It was also agreed that graduate coordinators would provide RGS with a paragraph on their decision making process, which RGS would then include in e-mails to applicants when their applications arrive. This allows applicants to then know how each department’s or school’s process plays out and when they might reasonably expect to hear in terms of admission.
- *AGA funding availability.* At the September meeting, coordinators were informed that some AGA funding was returned and could be reallocated. As per Committee operating policy, the allocation of AGA monies that become available after August 31st are decided by a subcommittee.

Submitted by:

David MacKinnon
Chair
Senate Committee on Graduate Studies

**Awards Committee for Honorary Degrees and Emeriti Distinction
(Awards Committee)**

Annual Report for 2012-2013

May 2013

Committee Members 2012-2013:

Mr. Ray Ivany, President & Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
Dr. Derek Charke, Faculty of Arts Representative
Dr. Harry Gardner, Acadia Divinity College/Faculty of Theology Representative
Mr. Matthew Rios, SRC Representative
Mr. John Rogers, Board of Governors Representative
Dr. Roxanne Seaman, Faculty of Professional Studies Representative
Dr. Anthony Tong, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science Representative
Ms. Pat Townsend, Librarian/Archivist Representative
Ms. Janny Postema, Recording Secretary

The Purpose of the Committee is to:

1. Invite nominations for Honorary Doctorate degrees and Professorships, Librarian, and Archivists Emeriti awards.
2. Adjudicate the nominations; and
3. Recommend nominees thereon to Senate.

Meetings 2012-2013:

February 7, 2013
February 21, 2013

Summary of Committee Activities:

The Committee forwarded to Senate for a vote by secret ballot a total of six Honorary Degrees and four Professor Emeritus nominations of which six Honorary Degrees and four Professor Emeritus received approval by Senate.

I would like to thank members of the Awards Committee (Dr. Derek Charke, Dr. Harry Gardner, Mr. Matthew Rios, Mr. John Rogers, Dr. Roxanne Seaman, Dr. Anthony Tong, and Ms. Pat Townsend) for their work over the past year.

Respectfully submitted by the Chair,

Raymond E. Ivany
President & Vice-Chancellor

SENATE ARCHIVES COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 2012-13

April 30, 2013

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:

Committee Chair and Arts representative: Paul Doerr (2015)
Arts representative and Committee secretary: Jennifer MacDonald (2013)
Arts representative: Lance LaRocque (2014)
Professional Studies representative: Brenda Trofanenko (2015)
Science representative: Barbara Anderson (2013)
Theology representative: Robert Wilson (2014)
Alumni appointee: Vacant
Presidential appointee: Ann Smith (2015)
Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches appointee: D. Cumby (2013)
Student representative: E. Cochrane
Archivist: Pat Townsend (ex-officio)
Archivist: Wendy Robicheau (ex-officio)
University Librarian: Sara Lohead (ex-officio)

COMMITTEE MANDATE: As representatives of their various constituencies, members of the Senate Archives Committee will work collaboratively:

- (1) To advise and guide on long-term and short-term directions that are consistent with the mandate and strategic direction of the Archives;
- (2) To advocate for the Archives within the University, the Convention of the Atlantic Baptist Churches and the local community;
- (3) To make an annual report;
- (4) To address other Archives-related issues that shall arise from time to time.

ACTIVITIES THIS YEAR: After several years on hiatus, the Senate Archives Committee rebounded this year with untrammelled enthusiasm. We met on three occasions (October 18, 2012; February 14, 2013 and April 25, 2013) to discuss issues of concern to Acadia's Archives. We reviewed and reaffirmed the Committee's mandate and membership. We received and reviewed activity reports from the Archivists. The committee also developed a procedure for receiving minutes and reports from the Senate and Senate committees (attached). This procedure will come before the Senate in May. Finally, the committee discussed ideas for highlighting the profile of the Acadia Archives, ideas which will surface in time for Acadia's 175th anniversary in the fall.

MOTION: That Senate adopt the attached schedule and procedure for archiving Senate materials.

Retention Schedule for Senate and Senate Committees

Senate – Original Minutes and Reports

Records consist of minutes and reports produced as a result of meetings of the Acadia University Senate. The Recording Secretary of the Senate is the official record keeper and ensures that the minutes are correct, complete including appendices, and signed by the Recording Secretary of Senate.

At the end of each academic year (end of June), the Recording Secretary transfers the year’s minutes and reports to the Archives, after making convenience copies for the office. Minutes and reports transferred to the Archives must be viewed in the Archives’ Reading Room and may not be duplicated without permission of the Chair of the Senate.

The Recording Secretary’s convenience copies are held by the Recording Secretary until they are no longer needed, at which time the copies will be destroyed by secure shredding.

Senate Committees – Original Minutes and Reports

Records consist of minutes and reports produced as a result of meetings of the Acadia University Senate Committees. The Secretary or Chair of the Senate Committee is the official record keeper and ensures that the minutes are correct, complete including appendices, and signed by the Chair of Senate Committee or the Secretary.

At the end of each academic year (end of June), the Committee Secretary or Chair transfers the year’s minutes and reports to the Archives,¹ after making convenience copies for the office. Minutes and reports transferred to the Archives must be viewed in the Archives’ Reading Room and may not be duplicated without permission of the Secretary or Chair of the Senate Committee.

The Committee’s convenience copies are held by the Secretary or Chair until the copies are no longer needed, at which time the copies will be destroyed by secure shredding.

SCHEDULE	Active	Semi-Active	Final Disposition
Senate and Senate Committees – <i>original</i> minutes and reports	Current Year	No	Archival Retention
Convenience copies of minutes and reports held by Secretaries or Chairs	While needed	No	Destroy

¹ An annual transfer of these documents will ensure that the following condition is met: “The Secretary or Chair, of each Senate Committee, shall forward the committee records (minutes, agendas, correspondence, reports, and supporting papers) to the University Archives for permanent preservation.” The Constitution and By-Laws of the Senate of Acadia University, 2012 amendment, section VI. Committees, page 8.