



Minutes of the Senate meeting of 18th June 2013.

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Tuesday 18th June, 2013 beginning at 2:00 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 26 present, increasing to 31 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 President Ivany, B. Ells, S. Bethune, H. Rode, M. Snyder, R. Worvill, R. Jotcham, D. MacKinnon, R. Murphy, B. Anderson, S. Major, S. Hewitt, I. Hutchinson, and H. Kitchin. The Chair noted that N. Clarke could be late arriving.

The Chair welcomed guests C. Rushton to the meeting and was expecting R. Karsten.

The Chair updated Senate on the issue of four differing membership lists existing for Senate, none of which matched. The corrections went forward to the Board of Governors for their approval. The Board responded that they could not match their lists to the amended membership list that went forward. The Chair will meet with the Governance Committee at some point and come to an agreement on the lists, at which point both the Board and Senate will ratify the changes.

The Chair had met to discuss a joint planning committee – the ARC and the APC – with the Chair of the Board of Governors. The ARC was an ad hoc committee of the Board and had now been reinstated, but still lacked a Chair. Once a Chair has been selected, these two committees can meet.

The Chair reported that Senate Executive met on June 11th and approved Senate dates for 2013-14. These dates will be posted on the Senate website. The October meeting will be held on a Tuesday, while the November meeting will be held the Monday following Remembrance Day. The Chair also noted that a June meeting will be scheduled on a date yet to be decided.

The Chair noted that although it was felt that meetings were progressing well, Senate remained largely reactive rather than proactive. The Executive felt that more groundwork could be carried out prior to a Senate meeting, so that less detail work was carried out on the floor of Senate. On behalf of the Executive, the Chair recommended that Senators feel free to contact relevant committees or individuals before a Senate meeting if they know they have concerns with the wording of a motion coming forward to Senate. It may be

possible to come to a mutually satisfactory resolution before the meeting, saving time crafting amendments on the Senate floor. The Executive also recommends that committees consider adopting this approach when matters have been referred back to them for further work. Checking in with Senators who had expressed concerns before the meeting, to see if the proposed changes address their concerns, is perfectly acceptable, and again might save time devoted to amendments and wordsmithing on the Senate floor.

The Chair noted that Senate Executive would meet again in July to determine some initial ideas for goals and priorities for Senate next year. The Chair stressed that this was not designed to be a closed group, and encouraged Senators to offer ideas and input through any member of the Executive. The Chair reported that at the September meeting of Senate, time would be allotted for an open discussion of any ideas that the Executive brought forward.

R. Karsten joined the meeting.

b) From the Vice-President Academic

T. Herman reported that Acadia would be hosting the on-site institute for the Province's joint Ph.D. in Educational Studies.

T. Herman noted that students continued to represent Acadia very well at conferences, and particularly at the recent CANCOM conference in St. John's, where Chemistry students brought back nine awards. T. Herman read out the names of all of the nine students and passed on congratulations.

T. Herman reported that J. Hennessy would be stepping down as Director of the School of Music and taking a one year Administrative Leave. T. Herman thanked J. Hennessy for his service to Senate and to various sub-committees of Senate.

T. Herman noted that J. Sacouman would be retiring and that H. Kitchin would take over as Head of Sociology.

T. Herman noted that Research and Graduate Studies were once again offering grant mentoring workshops to faculty members, which will hopefully pay off in the coming year.

T. Herman noted recent faculty awards: T. Avery and S. Mockford received a significant grant to work with the Department of Natural Resources to develop species friendly highway construction approaches. T. Avery also received a grant from the Habitat Stewardship Program for Species at Risk, to work on citizen, science and stewardship, with regard to striped bass. T. Herman noted the community involvement with this grant, including the Mi'kmaq and Anglers' Association.

T. Herman reported that A. Tong and J. Murimboh were part of a team to be awarded a Canadian Water Network grant to work on municipal water supplies. Once again, this was a multi-institutional project.

T. Herman attended the official launch of the Atlantic Wine Institute, which is now housed on the top floor of Patterson. This institute is directed by D. Sears.

T. Herman noted changes recently to the Coop program and explained that international students were keen to experience Coop opportunities. Students from small units had also experienced difficulties in the past because of the

very structured approach to Coop. T. Herman also noted that students from the Faculty of Arts were keen to enjoy Coop opportunities. C. MacRae will now join the Coop team to help cope with the increased case load.

The Chair noted that the meeting now had quorum, and asked whether there were any questions for T. Herman.

P. Doerr asked about the recent announcement that one individual, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, would also take on the University Head Librarian position, as a result of the retirement of the University Head Librarian.

T. Herman noted that this was correct, but that this would be an interim position, and noted that the Dean's teaching load would need to be adjusted.

P. Doerr asked whether a search for a permanent University Head Librarian would be conducted soon. T. Herman was not able to place a timeline on the search.

A. Smith noted that despite many positive attributes, the Dean of Arts was not a qualified or practising Librarian, and asked for further clarification as to the timeline for hiring a qualified University Head Librarian. T. Herman could not provide a timeline, but agreed to take the comments under advisement.

L. Aylward asked why the University Administration would not draw from the existing expertise in the Library and appoint an Acting Head Librarian from the ranks of academic librarians.

A. Quema enquired about the rationale for the appointment. T. Herman responded that R. Perrins was the most appropriate of the four Deans to take on the role.

2) Approval of Agenda

The Chair noted that Senators had only received the agenda 6.5 days earlier and because the agenda included motions, it would be necessary to waive the requirement for notice of motion. This would require majority approval of all Senators.

The Chair asked if there were any objections to waiving the notice of motion. There were none.

Motion to approve the agenda. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by C. Stanley.

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 May, 2013

Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 8th May as distributed. Moved by A. Smith, seconded by D. Benoit.

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

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES CARRIED.

4) Time-Sensitive Issues:

a) Nominations from the Nominating Committee
(*attached*)

J. Hennessy reported that a nomination had been received for W. Brackney to serve on the By Laws Committee.

J. Hennessy had also received a nomination for S. McCullough to serve as a Lay Person on Senate.

The Chair called three times for any further nominations. There being none, W. Brackney and S. McCullough were elected by acclamation. The Chair congratulated and thanked them for agreeing to serve.

P. Williams pointed out that the CV of S. McCullough should be removed from the Senate website and only circulated to Senators. The Chair agreed.

5) New Business

a) Senate Committee Annual Reports

The Chair reminded Senate that no motion was required to receive the annual reports.

i) Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee (2011-2012) (*attached*)

The Chair noted that this report was for the period 2011-2012. This committee prefers to report later, because in May at the time of the usual annual reports, it is not known how many scholarships would be taken up by incoming students.

R. Karsten stated that offers were made to 970 students, with a total monetary value of \$1.4 million. R. Karsten noted that offers were slightly up in 2013, with 1040 students receiving scholarship offers.

ii) Senate Executive Committee
(*attached*)

The Chair reported that Senate Executive met three times in 2012-13 and that she reported back to Senate from this Committee. The committee was working to keep track of items moving forward to Senate and other Senate sub-committees. The committee may be bringing forward a recommendation that uniform procedures for excused absences be developed. Policies on academic integrity may also be coming forward to Senate. The Chair noted that copies of Senate Executive agenda and minutes could be obtained from R. Hare.

iii) Library Committee
(*attached*)

W. Brackney spoke for the Library Committee and reported that the committee met once. The main item of business was the comprehensive collection development review, due in the fall. W. Brackney reported that the committee had discussed whether they should continue, or combine with the Archives committee. The decision was that the committee should continue to exist as a stand-alone committee.

There were no policy recommendations. Current staffing level in the Library remained unchanged. The committee appreciated the contribution made by S. Lochhead over the last 10 years. W. Brackney also supported the comments from Senators earlier in the meeting, and felt confident of speaking for other members of the committee.

P. Williams asked whether the Library committee was consulted about the decision to replace the Head Librarian with the Dean of Arts. W. Brackney confirmed that the committee was not consulted.

- iv) Academic Program Review Committee (*attached*)
T. Herman reported that the committee met on seven occasions. Much of the backlog has now been dealt with, and a number of reviews have been completed. Responses from the units of Philosophy and the School of Music have been received. T. Herman noted that the page showing the schedule of upcoming reviews was missing from the attached document, and agreed to circulate it for the September meeting.
- v) Admissions and Academic Standing (Policy) (*attached*)
T. Herman noted that several issues had been dealt with during the year, all of which were detailed on the attached report. These included: Minimum number of 3000/4000 level courses for degree completion; Transitioning from alpha to numeric grades; Definition of Mature Student. Regarding the minimum number of 3000/4000 level courses required, T. Herman noted, as indicated in the report, that no action was considered necessary at this time, but units might want to monitor their own curriculum on an ongoing basis around this issue.

D. Benoit questioned setting a minimum number of 3000/4000 level, and felt that if an individual unit had decided that its students could graduate without third or fourth year courses, it should not be an issue to the University if it was not a concern to the unit.

T. Herman agreed that this might not necessarily be a concern in all cases, but it became a concern in some instances, particularly if the curriculum was so skewed towards lower level courses that students were unable to take upper level courses even if they desired to do so. The majority of programs did require students to take a certain number of upper level courses.

The Chair noted that when the proposal for the ESST program went to MPHEC several years ago, they were required to include 18 hours of upper level courses, suggesting that MPHEC feels some exposure to upper year courses is essential for a sound curriculum. There was currently no overall university minimum number of courses required, and programs varied widely in their own requirements.

T. Herman noted that if this issue came up during an academic program review, recommendations for changes might be made on a case by case basis by the APRC. However, if there was an issue within the unit, they should feel free to address it without waiting for an academic program review.

C. Stanley felt it was premature to worry about this issue until definitions had been put in place to demonstrate what constituted a third or fourth year level course. Units numbered courses for a variety of reasons, and the numbering was not always reflective of the complexity of the course content.

T. Herman agreed with the observation and felt that different units numbered courses differently and for different reasons.

A. Quema felt that the Curriculum committee could contribute to this process and noted that a curriculum form had been created for new programs which included a number of questions based upon the criteria provided by MPHEC. Levels of checks exist and the Curriculum committee could monitor or double check for this issue.

P. Williams found that almost all other universities did specify a minimum level of upper level courses.

T. Herman felt that it would be an excellent idea for the Curriculum committee to monitor the matter.

vi) Board of Open Acadia (*attached*)

J. Banks reported that Open Acadia enjoyed a good year, coming in close to budget. J. Banks stressed, however, that Open Acadia existed to facilitate the academic units that drive those programs, particularly the School of Education. J. Banks listed a number of highlights and activities that would be of interest to Senate, all of which were detailed fully in the attached report. Open Acadia works with several units to provide on-line intersession offerings. J. Banks noted that the on-line space is becoming very competitive, especially with the introduction of MOOCs.

J. Banks noted that Open Acadia was involved with the English for Academic Purposes program offering. A reduction in the number of students was seen in 2012, but it was expected that numbers will start to grow again in the fall.

Programs were offered for the Coastguard College and may continue. J. Banks also mentioned the Acadia Lifelong Learning program, which was small, but important in terms of community involvement.

vii) Academic Planning Committee (*attached*)

T. Herman reported that the committee had met 11 times, with one more meeting still to come. The committee has been in consultation with units undergoing significant change: Recreation Management, Nutrition and Dietetics, Music, and Earth and Environmental Science. Information will be coming forward to Senate.

T. Herman reported that the committee was carrying out a review and analysis of existing planning and academic processes, building on themes first identified by the ad hoc Academic Planning and Priorities Committee's unit surveys.

T. Herman drew attention to broad principles that could be considered as elements of an Academic Planning framework; these being *Adaptability*, *Diversity*, and *Program Impact/Engagement Beyond the Borders*. Senators were asked to consider these principles and provide feedback over the summer to the APC (prior to the September Senate meeting).

T. Herman noted that as a response to Senate directing the APC to review the activities of the TTTCAC and to propose a new process, the APC was bringing forward a motion to Senate later in the meeting.

L. Aylward asked whether the principles being generated by the APC and those from the APPC were being combined to work towards one planning framework.

T. Herman agreed that this was the case.

b) APC Motion regarding Permanent Faculty Hiring Process (*attached*)

The Chair reminded Senators that at the last Senate meeting the decision was taken to disband the TTTCAC. The APC were asked to make recommendations regarding an alternative process.

Motion that whereas Senate has directed the Academic Planning Committee to review the activities of the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee and to propose a process that links the allocation of tenure-track faculty to programming requirements from

an overall academic planning perspective, the APC moves the adoption of the following process governing the hiring of Permanent Faculty:

The Process

- 1) Provides opportunity for program and faculty level input with respect to establishing priorities;
- 2) Represents a synthesis within the academic sector that allows for integration into academic planning as approved by Senate;
- 3) Incorporates a review and approval by Senate of the selection produced in step 2 of the process (below)
- 4) Contains a final selection by the VP-Academic, through reference to the Senate-approved report and in consultation with the Deans, that integrates the academic priorities with financial considerations
- 5) Requires a report by the VP-Academic to Senate of the rationale for the final selection

The VP-Academic will report to Deans in October whether a hiring environment is anticipated in the upcoming year. Deans will transmit this information to program heads and directors for information and/or action.

The Process is as follows:

- 1) Programs develop requests upon the basis of their own rationale. They may draw on any background information or data they wish in preparation of those requests. Relevant Faculties provide input indicating the relative priorities, together with a rationale for those priorities, with reports submitted by Faculties to the APC by 15 February.
- 2) The APC reviews the reports submitted by Faculties and develops a ranked list for presentation to Senate as a motion for consideration at the April meeting of Senate at which it shall be the first item of business on the agenda.
- 3) Senate reviews, approves and submits a final ranked list to the VP-Academic no later than 1 May.
- 4) The VP-Academic makes final selection decisions by 1 August.
- 5) The VP-Academic reports to Senate at the September meeting of Senate on the rationale for the final selection.

This process will be employed in the hiring of tenure-track and continuing faculty, encompassing instructors, librarians, and professors. PAD/Lecteur/Lectrice, Part-Time, and CLT hiring is not included in this process.

Moved by T. Herman, seconded by P. Williams.

T. Herman discussed the motion, covering the five points that described the process that would be used.

Programs would develop their requests for staffing and Faculties would provide input before forwarding requests to the APC. The APC would develop a ranked list to be presented to Senate for the April meeting. Senate would review the recommendations made by the APC and give approval by May 1. A final ranked list approved by Senate would be forwarded to the

office of the VP Academic, and final hiring decisions would be made by August 1st of any given year. Feedback and accountability would be required from the office of the VP Academic if the final hiring deviated from the list approved by Senate.

W. Sights asked why the principles behind the process were included in the motion. W. Sights also noted that the mechanics of an appointment process were not included in the motion.

T. Herman responded that although this was a rather irregular motion, the committee wanted the permanent record to show the rationale behind the motion. He also agreed that this motion had nothing to do with the mechanics of hiring a faculty member, and was instead about the process to be used by departments and schools when determining positions to be filled.

The Chair agreed that the actual motion would be understood as encompassing the material from *The Process is as follows* .. forward.

A. Quema felt that overall she would be in support of the motion. With respect to point #2 A. Quema questioned the wording, which currently said **“The APC reviews the reports submitted by Faculties and develops a ranked list for presentation to Senate as a motion for consideration at the April meeting of Senate at which it shall be the first item of business on the agenda”**.

A. Quema did not believe that these were the original duties or mandate of the APC, and read out their mandate. A. Quema pointed out that there had been a process for ranking which no longer existed. A. Quema felt that no criteria now existed for the APC to develop a list for Senate review. A. Quema was concerned that insufficient consultation could lead to a lack of support by the departments and unhappy individuals.

A. Vibert felt that from a Director of a School point of view, she would appreciate the additional flexibility that this process provided when preparing the rationale. A. Vibert also agreed with A. Quema’s points earlier.

J. Hennessy felt that both consultation and accountability were included in the process. J. Hennessy asked whether the intention in Point #1 was that all units would now be able to request a tenure track replacement whether they were experiencing retirements or not.

S. Lochhead noted that the last paragraph of the motion indicated that the process would be used in the hiring of *tenure track and continuing faculty, encompassing instructors, librarians, and professors*. S. Lochhead pointed out that the Librarians had not been included in the TTTCAC process previously. The wording of the motion would need to be altered throughout because there was no mention of Librarians. S. Lochhead also felt that a library representative would need to be added to the APC membership.

T. Herman agreed that it was intentional to include Librarians in the process, and agreed that the wording of the document should be altered.

T. Herman felt that the membership of the APC was a separate issue.

S. Lochhead felt that the University Librarian should be added to the APC and felt that as the three Deans sat on this committee, there was every justification

for the Library's equivalent to also be included.

The Chair noted that amendments to include the library more fully in the process would be in order at the current meeting; however, any change to the membership of the APC would be a change to the by-laws, requiring the usual 30 days' notice of motion.

J. Banks agreed with J. Hennessy, but felt that the process lacked feedback because once a school or department submitted their list, there was no point at which that submission came back to them. Questions that might come up during the review by the APC could not be addressed by the departments.

C. Stanley noted that the process took about 22 months to complete at present, and would like this pace to be speeded up.

P. Williams addressed A. Quema's concerns that the APC would be working beyond their original mandate, noting that the APC would bring a motion to Senate for approval, and that Senate would be entirely free to debate and amend the motion.

P. Williams noted that decisions to hire a tenure track position had implications for the next 30 years, so that there was little reason to speed up hiring processes based on data from any given year, or to base decisions on temporary enrolment spikes.

A. Quema was pleased that the democratic process would be followed, but still felt that confusion existed around what the APC was doing. A. Quema felt that the APC would need to explain very carefully to Senators the criteria that the committee was using to make its recommendations.

P. William responded to J. Banks and stated that there was nothing in the motion that precluded a department from being asked to meet with the APC to clarify information.

S. Lockhead proposed amendments to the motion, indicated in italics below.

Motion that whereas Senate has directed the Academic Planning Committee to review the activities of the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee and to propose a process that links the allocation of tenure-track faculty to programming requirements from an overall academic planning perspective, the APC moves the adoption of the following process governing the hiring of Permanent Faculty:

The Process

- 1) Provides opportunity for *library*, program and faculty level input with respect to establishing priorities;**
- 2) Represents a synthesis within the academic sector that allows for integration into academic planning as approved by Senate;**
- 3) Incorporates a review and approval by Senate of the selection produced in step 2 of the process (below)**
- 4) Contains a final selection by the VP-Academic, through reference to the Senate-approved report and in consultation with the Deans *and University Librarian*, that integrates the academic priorities with financial considerations**
- 5) Requires a report by the VP-Academic to Senate of the rationale**

for the final selection

The VP-Academic will report to Deans *and University Librarian* in October whether a hiring environment is anticipated in the upcoming year. Deans *and the University Librarian* will transmit this information to program heads and directors for information and/or action.

The Process is as follows:

- 1) Programs develop requests upon the basis of their own rationale. They may draw on any background information or data they wish in preparation of those requests. Relevant Faculties *and/or the Library* provide input indicating the relative priorities, together with a rationale for those priorities, with reports submitted by Faculties *and/or the Library* to the APC by 15 February.
- 2) The APC reviews the reports submitted by Faculties *and/or the Library* and develops a ranked list for presentation to Senate as a motion for consideration at the April meeting of Senate at which it shall be the first item of business on the agenda.
- 3) Senate reviews, approves and submits a final ranked list to the VP-Academic no later than 1 May.
- 4) The VP-Academic makes final selection decisions by 1 August.
- 5) The VP-Academic reports to Senate at the September meeting of Senate on the rationale for the final selection.

This process will be employed in the hiring of tenure-track and continuing faculty, encompassing instructors, librarians, and professors. PAD/Lecteur/Lectrice, Part-Time, and CLT hiring is not included in this process. Moved by S. Lockhead, seconded by W. Brackney.

AMENDED MOTION CARRIED.

J. Hennessy asked whether Instructors were to be ranked in the same process as the tenure track faculty. J. Hennessy noted that Instructors were not counted in the faculty complement list.

T. Herman explained that the intent was to be as flexible as possible. The mechanics of dealing with these positions separately would erode program and academic planning, and T. Herman stated that the APC felt that there was a need to integrate these different positions into the same academic process.

J. Hennessy discussed potential difficulties if the list is mixed with faculty, Instructors and Librarians.

T. Herman saw this as an integrated list and not a concern.

H. Hemming drew attention to point # 4 *The VP-Academic makes final selection decisions by 1 August*. H. Hemming asked whether the VP Academic would always make the final selection in the same order as the ranking from the APC and Senate. T. Herman agreed that the VP Academic might not always make the final selection in the same order, but that if the order was altered he would have to justify any change.

A. Smith found the process to be highly problematic given the lack of representation of the University Librarian on the APC. A. Smith noted that librarians also have a complement, whereas instructors do not.

The Chair noted that there are no instructors on Senate at present.

L. Aylward asked whether the naming of the motion was important because it was a process to be used for deciding on the allocation of positions, not for hiring. It should not be confused with the process of hiring itself, which is governed by collective agreements, employment equity provisions, etc..

The Chair stated that the title of the motion could be changed with an amendment. She asked if there were any objections to amending the title to more accurately reflect the content of the motion. There being none, the amendment was made.

Title of the motion amended from 'Motion from the Academic Planning Committee: Permanent Faculty Hiring Process' to 'Motion from the Academic Planning Committee: Decision-making Process for Allocating Permanent Faculty Positions'.

J. Guiney Yallop expressed concerns that the motion needed more work, especially to fully integrate instructors and librarians into the process.

Motion to refer the item back to the committee. Moved by J. Guiney Yallop, seconded by A. Smith.

J. Banks expressed concern that if the motion was referred back to the committee this would create an issue of timing for getting the process in place for the coming year.

A. Quema noted that even on Senate there were questions and she was concerned that across the campus there would be even more questions. She was concerned that constituents would not feel that there had been sufficient consultation. A. Quema felt that it would be premature to approve the document in Senate.

D. Benoit noted that he had been consulted and felt that the APC had done a comprehensive job of asking people what they wanted. Although the motion could be sent back to the APC and return to Senate once again, Senate by that time would be altered in membership, and there would be no guarantee that Senators would be any happier at that time. The APC would not be unilaterally determining hiring allocations; instead, it would be giving recommendations to Senate, and explaining why they were giving the recommendations they were. D. Benoit was in favour of voting on the motion today.

The Chair clarified that according to the current motion, the APC would simply be presenting a ranked list of recommended hires to Senate. It would not be required to present any rationales for its decisions.

J. Hennessy was prepared to support the basic motion today, but felt that the instructors and librarians issue needed to be referred back to the committee.

The Chair asked noted that if Senators would like to take that approach, they could do so by voting down the motion to refer to committee, removing language referring to instructors and librarians from the current motion, and referring the issue of properly integrating instructors and librarians back to committee.

A. Quema asked whether once the motion was approved, the APC would be interested in engaging in a process of explanation and consultation with faculty.

T. Herman agreed that this was very much the spirit of the APC and part of their mandate.

MOTION TO REFER THE MOTION BACK TO COMMITTEE
FAILED.

Discussion of the main motion continued.

D. Benoit noted that it was important that the APC provide reasoning and rationales behind its decisions to Senate, to allow for proper debate and an informed vote.

Motion to change 2) ‘and develops a ranked list for presentation to Senate....’ to ‘and develops a ranked list and report with rationale for presentation to Senate...’ Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by J. Banks.

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

B. Latta asked whether Senate would have access to the original requests submitted by individual units.

T. Herman agreed that the requests would be available, because they were part of the public record.

The Chair stated for the record that making those requests publicly available would be understood to be part of the process.

J. Hennessy wished to remove instructors and librarians from the current motion, to allow further consideration of how best to integrate them into the process.

Proposed amendment to the final paragraph, which currently read ‘This process will be employed in the hiring of tenure-track and continuing faculty, encompassing instructors, librarians, and professors. PAD/Lecteur/Lectrice, Part-Time, and CLT hiring is not included in this process’.

to now read

‘This process will be employed in the hiring of tenure-track professors. PAD/Lecteur/Lectrice, Part-Time, and CLT hiring is not included in this process’. Moved by J. Hennessy, seconded by S. Lockhead.

W. Slights asked about the status of the earlier amendments, which added language to incorporate the librarians into the process.

The Chair stated that a ‘motion to reconsider’ could be proposed on those amendments, if the current amendment passed. Senate could re-vote on accepting those amendments, in light of this new amendment. The previously-passed amendments could therefore be defeated, if desired.

P. Williams suggested further amendments to the main motion, and the Chair noted that such amendments could be considered after voting on the current amendment.

AMENDMENT FAILED.

P. Williams proposed removing the concept of a single ranked list, as there would be difficulties establishing one ranked list for different types of positions. Instead, the APC would present a report making recommendations for hiring, but not necessarily one single ranked list.

Motion to change

- 2) **'and develops a ranked list and report with rationale for presentation to Senate...**
- 3) **Senate reviews, approves and submits a final ranked list to the VP-Academic no later than 1 May'.**

to

- 2) **and develops recommendations for hiring priorities and report with rationale for presentation to Senate...**
- 3) **Senate reviews, approves and submits a final recommendation for hiring priorities to the VP-Academic no later than 1 May.**

Moved by P. Williams, seconded by D. Benoit.

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

A. Quema asked where this language and this document would appear.

The Chair noted that it would appear in the minutes of Senate, but that it could also be posted on the Senate website, in the section would list Senate policies.

A. Quema felt that Senate was now participating in the hiring process. She was concerned that the process was not codified anywhere more formal, such as in the Senate By-laws, and was subject to change at any time.

The Chair agreed that the process could in fact be changed at any time, through a majority vote at Senate.

J. Banks pointed out that Senate was only making priority recommendations to the VP Academic, rather than having a final say in the hiring process.

D. Benoit referred back to comments made by C. Stanley earlier. He was also concerned at the length of time that it could take to hire a tenure track faculty member. If a department experienced a late resignation, it could be two years before a replacement was hired. D. Benoit particularly noted that this could be a concern for units whose programs were accredited. In these programs, a CLT might not be an appropriate replacement.

T. Herman was not concerned and pointed out that CLT's could be offered various terms of employment. T. Herman felt that there was ample flexibility to cover the scenario that D. Benoit raised.

Adam Foster asked what a CLT was and the Chair explained that this was a contractually limited term appointment; generally 9.5 months, 12 months or three years.

OVERALL MOTION APPROVED AS AMENDED.

Motion from the Academic Planning Committee: Decision-Making Process for Allocating Permanent Faculty Positions

Whereas Senate has directed the Academic Planning Committee to review the activities of the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee and to propose a process that links the allocation of tenure-track faculty to programming requirements from an overall academic planning perspective, the APC moves the adoption of the following process governing the hiring of Permanent Faculty:

The Process

- 1) Provides opportunity for Library, program and faculty level input with respect to establishing priorities;
- 2) Represents a synthesis within the academic sector that allows for integration into academic planning as approved by Senate;
- 3) Incorporates a review and approval by Senate of the selection produced in step 2 of the process (below)
- 4) Contains a final selection by the VP-Academic, through reference to the Senate-approved report and in consultation with the Deans and University Librarian, that integrates the academic priorities with financial considerations
- 5) Requires a report by the VP-Academic to Senate of the rationale for the final selection

The VP-Academic will report to Deans and University Librarian in October whether a hiring environment is anticipated in the upcoming year. Deans and the University Librarian will transmit this information to program heads and directors for information and/or action.

Decision-Making Process for Allocating Permanent Faculty Positions:

- 1) Programs develop requests upon the basis of their own rationale. They may draw on any background information or data they wish in preparation of those requests. Relevant Faculties and/or the Library provide input indicating the relative priorities, together with a rationale for those priorities, with reports submitted by Faculties and/or the Library to the APC by 15 February.
- 2) The APC reviews the reports submitted by Faculties and/or the Library and develops recommendations for hiring priorities and a report with rationale for presentation to Senate as a motion for consideration at the April meeting of Senate at which it shall be the first item of business on the agenda.
- 3) Senate reviews, approves and submits a final recommendation for hiring priorities to the VP-Academic no later than 1 May.
- 4) The VP-Academic makes final selection decisions by 1 August.
- 5) The VP-Academic reports to Senate at the September meeting of Senate on the rationale for the final selection.

This process will be employed in the hiring of tenure-track, continuing faculty, encompassing instructors, librarians, and professors.

PAD/Lecteur/Lectrice, Part-Time, and CLT hiring is not included in

this process.

The Chair noted that this would be the new planning process for setting priorities for the hiring of tenure track and continuing faculty. The minutes would reflect the fact that the APC would hold public information sessions to communicate these new procedures more widely to the campus community. Also, the original requests for positions would be made publicly available by the APC, and the details of the process would be posted on the Senate website in the “policies” section.

- c) School of Creative Arts
*(attached with motion included
from B. Moody)*

Motion that Senate set in motion processes to explore further the feasibility of and mechanisms for establishing a School of Creative Arts at Acadia University. As a first step, the matter will be directed to the Academic Planning Committee for its input and recommendations. Moved by B. Moody, seconded by J. Hennessy.

B. Moody reminded Senate that when the report on English and Theatre Studies was received in September from the APRC, one of the recommendations was that a School of Fine Arts or Performing Arts be considered. That recommendation was referred to the faculty in the Faculty of Arts. Several meetings had been held and the majority was very enthusiastic about this possibility. B. Moody noted that Dalhousie University was moving in the same direction but that it would be important for Acadia to differentiate itself from Dalhousie. B. Moody stressed that faculty members felt it important that this initiative not be seen as a way to save money, and that if it was to be done on the cheap, it should not be done at all.

B. Moody had discussed this issue with Rod Morrison, VP Advancement, who was very supportive, especially if the school could be given the name of a sizeable donor. Faculty members were keen to have a School of Creative Arts, rather than fine and performing arts, because that would allow for the inclusion of the visual arts.

B. Moody stated that Senate would be asked to endorse the initiative in principle, and for it then to go to the APC for further feedback and consideration. B. Moody noted that other members from Theatre and Music were in Senate, and could also comment.

J. Hennessy stressed that this would not be a move to efficiency but a move to growth, which would require an injection of external funding. He noted that there were concerns as to how a unit such as this would be governed and how it would fit into the Academic sector. The School of Music already experienced that fact that it was a very different unit from others in the Faculty of Arts.

A. Foster asked whether this would involve the degree itself having a name change. B. Moody agreed that some new programs might be named differently.

A. Quema asked whether what was being discussed was a School acting as an umbrella for several different individual programs, or in the long run one truly inter-disciplinary program.

B. Moody responded that the shape would be up to Senate and the units that would be involved. He felt that it did open the door for this sort of truly interdisciplinary cooperation.

R. Seale believed that it was rather early in the discussion to be talking about specifics, such as whether the degree awarded would be a BA or a BFA degree. R. Seale noted that at the meetings many new ideas were voiced and some extremely creative ideas came out that would make a Creative Arts program at Acadia very distinct from other programs across the country. R. Seale stated that faculty members had been voicing creative ideas not heard before and that Acadia was sufficiently small and pliable to offer something very different and distinct. A move to the title of Creative Arts highlighted that difference. R. Seale pointed out that the world class stage in the festival theatre was the only one of its kind east of Montreal and also drew Senator's attention to the Deep Roots festival and numerous other attractive features, both in the town of Wolfville and at Acadia.

R. Seale asked Senators when they had last felt excited about anything new happening at Acadia! R. Seale noted that this initiative would attract students and that this was in large part how it would be funded.

J. Stanley wondered what the landscape looked like and whether at some point the program would need to go to MPHEC for approval.

The Chair agreed that MPHEC approval would need to be sought.

J. Guiney Yallop felt that there would be inter-disciplinary opportunities within the unit, but that there would also be opportunities across different units.

J. Hennessy stated that some of the courses that are already being taught have a clear inter-disciplinary focus. J. Hennessy would like to see some of those courses opened up to other students across the campus.

G. Phillips spoke in favour of the motion.

MOTION PASSED.

6) Adjournment

Motion to adjourn, moved by J. Banks.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Nominations from the Nominating Committee:

The following two nominations should be presented to senate at the June meeting:

1. Theology representative on By-Laws Committee – William Brackney
2. Lay Representative on Senate – Sheonagh McCullough

ACADIA UNIVERSITY

Report of the SCHOLARSHIPS, PRIZES AND AWARDS COMMITTEE (SPAC) to SENATE

REPORT DATE: April 22, 2013

SPAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Membership	July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012	July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013
Arts	Stephen Ahern	Stephen Ahern
	Anna Saroli	Thomas Voss replacing Anna from July 1 to December 31, 2012 Anna Saroli back January 1, 2013
	Emma Cochrane (Student Rep)	Emma Cochrane (Student Rep)
Professional Studies	Scott Landry	Scott Landry
	Igor Semenenko	Igor Semenenko
	Colin Deal (Student Rep)	Darcy Shea (Student Rep)
Pure & Applied Science	Bryan van der Ende	Bryan van der Ende
	Jeff Hooper (Committee Chair)	Richard Karsten (Committee Chair)
	Sarah Sweet (Student Rep)	Alexandra Rice (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 (Committee 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

Committee meetings were held during 2011-2012 on the following dates:

February 23, 2012

March 2, 2012

March 25, 2012

April 27, 2012

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

The Bursary & Loan Committee of SPAC continued to meet weekly throughout the academic year.

AGENDAS, DISCUSSIONS and CONCLUSIONS

The following represents the main agenda topics:

1. Entrance Scholarship Offers

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

- 3 Chancellor's Scholarships each valued at \$10,000 renewable
- 4 Board of Governor's Scholarships each valued at \$8,000 renewable
- 4 President's Scholarships each valued at \$7,000 renewable
- 4 International Baccalaureate Scholarships each valued at \$6,500 renewable
- 8 Nova Scotia High School Tuition Scholarships each valued at \$4,000 renewable

2. Awarding of 2012 Entrance Scholarships

Acadia offered entrance scholarships to 970 students of the incoming class for September 2012. This included renewable entrance scholarship offers to all incoming students (in their first undergraduate degree) with an average above 80%. The acceptance rate for 2012 was 50% with 486 accepting their entrance scholarships (approximately \$1.4 M).

3. Committee Terms of Reference & Membership

As requested by Senate, the Committee reviewed its terms of reference and membership. No changes were made.

4. Committee Chair Terms of Reference

It was decided that each spring the Committee would elect a Chair for the upcoming July 1 to June 30 term.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont
Secretary

Richard Karsten
Chair

Senate Executive

Annual Report for 2012-2013

Committee Members 2012-2013

Diane Holmberg, Chair

Paul Doerr, Deputy Chair

Ray Ivany, President

Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic

Barry Moody, Dean of Arts

Peter Williams, Dean of Science

Heather Hemming, Dean of Professional Studies

David MacKinnon, Dean of Research and Graduate Studies

Harry Gardner, Dean of Theology

Rosemary Jotcham, Registrar

Kyle Power, Student Vice-President Academic

Jeff Hennessey, Arts Senator

Shelley MacDougall, Professional Studies Senator

Andrew Mitchell, Science Senator

Summary of Activities

The committee met on three occasions: September 24, 2012; January 10, 2013; and June 11, 2013.

It was agreed at the September meeting that three meetings would be held this year, at the beginning, middle, and end of the Senate year. At each meeting, members discussed ideas for improving the functioning of Senate, looked ahead to upcoming issues “on the horizon”, and received updates on the status of issues that will eventually be coming to Senate, but still require more preparation work (e.g., transitioning to numerical grades). More detailed minutes are available by request from the Recording Secretary, to any interested Senator.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Holmberg, Chair

Report of the Senate Standing Committee on the Library

Academic Year 2012-2013

Mandate of the Committee

The Library Committee is charged with five tasks: (1) Consult with various constituencies and to address their concerns, including the formation of policies; (2) Advocate for necessary and appropriate resources for the academic functions of the library; (3) Develop policy recommendations for the collections; (4) Develop policy recommendations with regard to library support of research; (5) Make an annual report.

Report on Committee Activities

The Committee met once during the academic year and discussed the work in general of the library, a comprehensive collection development policy review, staffing issues, and how the library was faring under budget constraints.

The University Librarian, Sara Lochhead, reported on the status of the Collection Development Review and indicated that the report would be ready for Fall, 2013. Widespread input to the survey is anticipated.

The Committee considered the question of the need for a Library Committee as requested of all standing committees and agreed that the committee is of fundamental importance to university academic accountability. Also, on the question of combining the Library and Archives Committees, the Library Committee believes they have two separate and important mandates and should continue their respective oversights.

Library staffing during this year remains constant with 8 professional librarians and archivists and 21 support staff.

The Librarian reported that through shared resources, good budgetary management, and departmental cooperation, the collection is developing effectively under the circumstances. The importance of considering Open Access publications should play a role in collection development.

No new policy recommendations are forthcoming at this time.

We anticipate ongoing discussion on the development of the Acadia Centre for Baptist and Anabaptist Studies, a centre of excellence jointly administered by

Vaughan Library and Acadia Divinity College. Patricia Townsend currently serves as chair of the ACBAS Administrative Committee on behalf of the Library.

As we close the academic year, we received the news of Sara Lochhead's retirement. This is a major change and Sara will be greatly missed. We wish Sara well and we trust that appropriate steps to fill the position of University Librarian will be given a high priority in faculty and administrative appointments.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Brackney, Chair
8 June 2013

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Annual Report to Senate for 2012-2013

June 18, 2103

Committee Members 2012-2013

Dr. Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic (Chair)
 Ms. Rosemary Jotcham, Registrar (Secretary)
 Dr. Jeff Hennessy
 Dr. David Piper (July 1 – December 31, 2012)
 Dr. Deb Day (January 1, 2013 -)
 Dr. Sonya Major
 Dr. 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:

Nov. 30, Dec. 3, 5, 7, 18, 19, 2012; Jan. 24, May 31, June 6, 2013

Department	Status	Report to Senate
Biology	Review scheduled for Fall 2013	
Math & Stats	Unit has met with APRC; awaiting written comments from Unit; APRC Recommendations to Senate pending	
School of Computer Science	APRC Recommendations to Senate	January 2013
School of Music	Review completed Winter 2013; Review panel report rec'd; awaiting response from School of Music	
School of Recreation Management & Kinesiology	APRC Recommendations to Senate	January 2013
Philosophy	Review completed Fall 2012; Review panel report rec'd; response received from unit; APRC to meet with Unit to review response	
Women's and Gender Studies	APRC met with WGST Coordinator; Recommendations to Senate	June 2013
School of Business	Review Complete; Recommendations to Senate	December 2012

Respectfully submitted,



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

ADMISSION & ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEE (Policy)

Annual Report to Senate for 2012-2013

June 18, 2013

Committee Members 2012-2013

Tom Herman (Chair)
Rosemary Jotcham (Secretary)
Peter Williams (Dean)
Barry Moody (Acting Dean)
Heather Hemming (Dean)
Jeff Banks (Acting Director)
Christian Thomas
Ian Hutchinson
David Piper
Barbara Anderson
Paul Arnold
Anna Robbins
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.

The Committee initiated work on three issues this year:

- 1) **Minimum number of 3000/4000 level courses for degree completion** – In response to concern expressed in Senate that some students were completing degrees with limited exposure to 3000/4000 courses, the Committee explored the extent of the problem. It determined that in many cases students actually take more upper year courses than strictly required because of course selection, i.e. in some units there are not enough 2000 level courses offered to meet all the ‘2000 level or above’ requirements. Although it is possible, in programs where a 3 and 4000 level requirement is not specifically stated, to take only 1000 and 2000 level courses, few do so.

Among the programs that require fewer than 12 hr. at the 3/4000 level there were only 2 with sufficient offerings at the 2000 level to permit a student to manage to graduate without accessing 3 or 4000 level courses – sociology and music (BAM program). In an assessment of recent graduates, of the 14 BAM graduates, only 1 took less than 12 hr. at the 3/4000 level; that individual took 9 hrs. In the BA Sociology program of 156 graduates only 3 took less than 12 hr. All 3 of the Sociology students had transferred into the degree. Two transferred from other institutions and one from another faculty within Acadia.

The Committee recognizes that there is merit in monitoring this issue going forward; to that end, individual units may wish to examine their course numbering/scheduling, advising protocols and curriculum delivery to insure that programs retain an appropriate and accessible course selection. One area of vigilance would be large programs with low numbers of required upper level

courses. Particularly likely to be of issue would be those in science where a minor can be only 12 hr, reducing the need for course selection at the higher levels in two subjects.

- 2) **Transitioning from alpha to numeric grades** – The Committee investigated options for transition to numeric grades, and their appearance on the transcript. After consultation with Technology Services (Information Systems) several things became apparent:
 - a. Since we currently keep both numeric and alpha grades, putting the numeric grade on the transcript, in addition to the existing alpha, is relatively straightforward.
 - b. If a shift is made, it will affect previous students who are requesting transcripts, in that all transcripts would be the same format, with the alpha and numeric grades showing. Those who took courses previously and are requesting grades after the transition would not get a transcript with only alpha grades.
 - c. There are presently two other changes under consideration that affect the transcript: i) including the name of the institution from which courses are transferred on the transcript; ii) including the minor on the transcript.
 - d. From a programming integrity perspective, if the transcript is going to be changed, it is probably most sensible to address all three simultaneously rather than separately. At a minimum, since the minor and grade changes have implications throughout Eden reporting, those two would need to be addressed simultaneously. The presently estimated time to implementation is approximately one year at a minimum.
- 3) **Definition of Mature Student** – The Committee explored the option of decreasing the present 4 year separation requirement. Other institutions define mature students differently; some are strictly age-based, regardless of previous university experience; others combine age and previous educational experience or previous inadmissibility. Requirements vary considerably. The Committee has no recommendation to change the present requirement at this time.

Meeting: October 4, 2012

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 2012-13**

June 17, 2013

Board Members for 2012-2013:

Dr. Tom Herman, Vice-President Academic, Chair

Dr. Robert Perrins, Dean of Arts

Dr. Peter Williams, 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, Director of Open Acadia

The Board of Open Acadia did not meet over the 2012-13 academic year. A meeting will be scheduled for the fall of 2013 (At which point Heather Ross will be welcomed as the Student Representative).

Open Acadia continues to work closely with Departments and Schools throughout the University to offer flexibility to students, and it was a busy completion to the 2012-2013 year. Enrolments in undergraduate courses increased about 11% year over year, including several new online courses developed in response to needs identified by departments. Spring and Summer 2012 saw more than 1400 undergraduate course registrations, and there were slightly over 600 in the Summer Institute for Graduate Education.

Operationally, Open Acadia continues to manage program delivery costs, and both credit and non-credit programs finished the 2012-13 fiscal year well, with good results on both year-over-year expenses and a net contribution in excess of \$1.9 million to the University. Given the continuing growth in demand for program delivery to geographically dispersed students, we are actively researching (in concert with other campus partners) tools that will enhance the personalized education experience that Acadia faculty can provide for students. As we support Departments and Schools in providing flexible options for students, the challenge of continuing growth will be an important one going forward.

Selected highlights and activities that would be of interest to Senate include:

- In support of the School of Education and the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Open Acadia is assisting in the offering of a new professional development programme for Middle School Mathematics teachers.
- The availability of online courses in Nutrition plays a key role in the Memorial-Acadia Nutrition “2+2” program that allows students to take the first two years of their program at Memorial and the final two years at Acadia.
- The part-time Certificate in French Proficiency program remains an attractive program for teachers in the province, with over 32 graduates to date.
- Our affiliations with the Dalhousie School of Nursing (Yarmouth site) and the Class Afloat program both continue, with plans to again offer courses via Open Acadia to students in 2013-2014.
- In 2012-13, the School of Education leveraged Open Acadia in starting several new graduate education cohorts, including a Counselling cohort in PEI and a second in partnership with the

Cape Chignecto region of the province, in addition to two Curriculum cohorts for Music Educators and another focused on Creativity in Teaching.

- The Teaching of English as a Second Language (TESOL) program continues to attract students, from the B.Ed program and beyond.
- In collaboration with the School of Education and the Dalhousie College of Medical Education, the second M.Ed. cohort for Health Interprofessionals also began in the fall of 2012.
- The English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program continues to play an important role in the recruitment of Acadia's international students. Offering 4 levels of comprehensive English training, this culturally diverse group of students is provided with the English skills needed to be successful at Acadia while having the opportunity to adjust to life in Canada and on campus.
- 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. In July, 2013, 42 new students from 2 Beijing Normal University campuses will be visiting Acadia for a similar 2 week program.
- Open Acadia renewed its \$212,000 contract with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans for delivery of the 2012-13 Physical Education program at the Canadian Coast Guard College in Sydney, NS.
- Huggins High School Science Seminar - The 28th Annual Huggins High School Science Seminar was held on Friday, May 4th, with 65 high school students from around the province in attendance. This year's theme was "Green Science", with presentations from Dr. Richard Karsten, Dr. Rob Singer, Dr. Edith Callaghan, Stephanie Boudreau, Dr. Vlad Zamlynny, in addition to a very successful Panel Debate.
- The Acadia Lifelong Learning program continues to be an important outreach program for the University; the 2013-14 slate of courses is being scheduled and the program will launch at the annual potluck event in August.

Respectfully Submitted,



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

Academic Planning Committee Report to Senate, June 2013

Preamble: The Academic Planning Committee (APC) was constituted as a Standing Committee of Senate by Senate at its meeting of 18 June 2012. The mandate of the APC is as follows: “The Academic Planning Committee shall make recommendations to Senate on matters relating to academic principles and planning. In carrying out its work, the Committee shall consult widely with all stakeholders and relevant bodies on campus. The APC shall report regularly to Senate, no less than two times per year.”

The APC membership is as follows:

- 1 Vice President Academic T. Herman (ex-officio)
- 1 Dean of Arts B. Moody (Acting) (ex-officio)
- 1 Dean of Prof. Studies H. Hemming (ex-officio)
- 1 Dean of P&A Sc. P. Williams (ex-officio)
- 1 Faculty Member D. McMullin 1 yr* (ret. 2013)
- 1 Faculty Member T. Weatherbee 2 yr* (ret. 2014)
- 1 Faculty Member D. Duke 3 yr (ret. 2015)
- 1 Student D. Shea 1 yr (ret. 2014)

The Chair of the Committee is the Vice President Academic.

(Source: Acadia University, Committees of Senate – 2012-13, p. 8.)

Since its last report to Senate (11 February 2013), the APC has met on ten occasions (13 February 2013, 27 March 2013, 24 April 2013, 30 April 2013, 7 May 2013, 14 May 2013, 22 May 2013, 31 May 2013, 5 June 2013, and 7 June 2013). For the information of Senators, please consult the 11 February 2013 report submitted to Senate for the activities of the APC prior to that date.

Consultation with Units Undergoing / That Have Undergone Significant Change

Building upon the activities outlined in the APC Report to Senate of February 2013 the committee has since consulted with representatives of several units that have recently undergone significant transformational change (Earth and Environmental Science, Recreation Management, Nutrition and Dietetics, Music). In those discussions we explored: internal and external circumstances that led to the need for change within the unit; initial response of unit members to the perceived need for change; planning strategies adopted within the unit to facilitate change; extent of administrative support in planning and execution of transformation in the unit; metrics used to assess unit health during the transformation; and the consideration of academic integrity in the process of identifying, planning, and implementing change in the unit. The results of those consultations are being reviewed at present.

Review and Analysis of Existing Planning and Academic Processes

The APC intends to continue wide consultation with units and programs in the coming year to examine current administrative/planning processes in the academic sector. Building on the emergent themes identified by the ad hoc APPC in 2011-12 from its unit surveys, the APC’s consultation will focus on processes that either inhibit or promote effective and responsive planning. These will help inform a generalized schema for an academic planning framework.

Academic Planning and Principles

The APC has been examining broad principles that will be considered as elements of an Academic Planning framework. These are:

Adaptability: the ability to respond to trends that develop over a 5-10 year timeframe; a process which incorporates the flexibility to reallocate resources to, and from, programs. Indeed, this is very likely to be the overarching element of any academic plan.

Diversity: we continue to affirm that diversity remains a fundamental component of the Acadia education.

Program Impact / Engagement Beyond the Borders: programs should engage in activities that reach beyond the classroom and indeed beyond the institution to generate, maintain, and seek to expand a presence, thereby adding value to Acadia's place within the broader community (local, provincial, beyond). Faculties should also be responsible for affirming the commitment to their constituent units, and for articulating why they are important to that particular Faculty as a whole.

In meeting our mandate to consult widely with the community we request that Senators consider these principles and provide feedback to the Committee prior to the September 2013 meeting of Senate.

TTTCAC Review Activities

Senate has directed the APC to review the activities of TTTCAC and to propose a process that links the allocation of tenure-track faculty to programming requirements from an overall academic planning perspective. On that basis the APC is proposing a motion at the 18 June 2013 governing the hiring of tenure-track, continuing faculty.

2013.06.10

Motion from the Academic Planning Committee: Permanent Faculty Hiring Process

Whereas Senate has directed the Academic Planning Committee to review the activities of the Tenure-Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee and to propose a process that links the allocation of tenure-track faculty to programming requirements from an overall academic planning perspective, the APC moves the adoption of the following process governing the hiring of Permanent Faculty:

The Process

- 6) Provides opportunity for program and faculty level input with respect to establishing priorities;
- 7) Represents a synthesis within the academic sector that allows for integration into academic planning as approved by Senate;
- 8) Incorporates a review and approval by Senate of the selection produced in step 2 of the process (below)
- 9) Contains a final selection by the VP-Academic, through reference to the Senate-approved report and in consultation with the Deans, that integrates the academic priorities with financial considerations
- 10) Requires a report by the VP-Academic to Senate of the rationale for the final selection

The VP-Academic will report to Deans in October whether a hiring environment is anticipated in the upcoming year. Deans will transmit this information to program heads and directors for information and/or action.

The Process is as follows:

- 6) Programs develop requests upon the basis of their own rationale. They may draw on any background information or data they wish in preparation of those requests. Relevant Faculties provide input indicating the relative priorities, together with a rationale for those priorities, with reports submitted by Faculties to the APC by 15 February.
- 7) The APC reviews the reports submitted by Faculties and develops a ranked list for presentation to Senate as a motion for consideration at the April meeting of Senate at which it shall be the first item of business on the agenda.
- 8) Senate reviews, approves and submits a final ranked list to the VP-Academic no later than 1 May.
- 9) The VP-Academic makes final selection decisions by 1 August.
- 10) The VP-Academic reports to Senate at the September meeting of Senate on the rationale for the final selection.

This process will be employed in the hiring of tenure-track, continuing faculty, encompassing instructors, librarians, and professors. PAD/Lecteur/Lectrice, Part-Time, and CLT hiring is not included in this process.

2013.06.10

A School of Creative Arts

Report to Senate and motion:

27 May 2013

At the 10 September 2013 meeting of Senate, the recommendations contained in the Academic Program Review Committee report on the Department of English and Theatre were approved. Included was recommendation #4:

Throughout the review and the review process it was evident that the two programs, English and Theatre Studies, are relatively autonomous, without an apparent shared vision. We recommend that the Dean of Arts, the School of Music, and faculty members in Theatre Studies explore the possibility of a school of fine/performing arts at Acadia.

The Dean met first with the head of the Department of English and Theatre (Dr. John Eustace) and the Director of the School of Music (Dr. Jeff Hennessy). We agreed that the idea was worth exploring further, although recognizing that there would be many issues to be resolved before such an ambitious undertaking could be accomplished. A meeting was then called of all members of the Theatre Studies unit and the School of Music.

At that meeting, there was very spirited and positive discussion of the pros and cons of the proposal. It was recognized by all that such an undertaking would require significant financial support but at the same time it was acknowledged that the fundraising opportunities encompassed in such a move could be significant. Although the formal announcement had not been made at this time, the meeting was aware that Dalhousie University was moving in a similar direction (with significant new funding), and it was felt that it will become increasingly important over the next few years to differentiate ourselves from the Dalhousie program. This might well serve as the vehicle to help accomplish this.

A strong preference emerged during the meeting for a school of creative arts, rather than fine and/or performing arts, which should include the visual arts as well. The meeting recommended that the idea be pursued, with no dissenting views and considerable enthusiasm being expressed.

It is therefore recommended that:

Senate set in motion processes to explore further the feasibility of and mechanisms for establishing a School of Creative Arts at Acadia University. As a first step, the matter will be directed to the Academic Planning Committee for its input and recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Moody,

Acting Dean of Arts