



Minutes of the Senate meeting of 11 March 2013.

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 11th March, 2013 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 43 present.

- 1) Approval of Agenda **Motion to approve the agenda moved by C. Stanley, seconded by H. Kitchin. Approved.**

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

MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA CARRIED.

- 2) Minutes of the Meeting of 11th February, 2013 **Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 11th February as distributed. Moved by H. Kitchin, seconded by D. Benoit.**

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

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES CARRIED.

3) **Announcements**

a) **From the Chair of Senate**

Regrets were received from E. Callaghan, R. Murphy, and B. Leslie.

The Chair explained that a prior commitment in Halifax meant that she would be asking Paul Doerr, the Vice-Chair of Senate, to chair the final 30 minutes of the meeting.

The Chair now welcomed everyone and noted that R. Hare would be assuming the Senate Secretary role. The Chair thanked J. Postema for her outstanding assistance to Senate during the last year and a half, and noted that she had met with J. Postema and R. Hare for a transitional meeting. During the summer, the Chair planned to create a handbook of Senate Secretariat duties for Recording Secretaries, which would prove helpful should a Senate secretary leave and another not be appointed immediately.

The Chair noted that the Budget Advisory Committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting, and that the committee was discussing what could be considered an appropriate deficit size for 2013-14. Discussion also covered areas such as the Office of Advancement, where costs have increased as the result of an expanded staff complement. The Chair noted that the expansion was expected to generate returns in the form of donations to the University. The Chair noted that discussions of other areas where financial expenditure could be trimmed were taking place at the Senior Executive Committee level; members of the Budget Advisory Committee were welcome to give suggestions and reactions, but were not actively involved in that part of the process. The Chair invited Senators to provide her with creative ideas that she

could take forward to the Budget Advisory Committee.

J. Hennessy asked whether minutes existed for the Budget Advisory Committee.

The Chair stated that were being generated, as they had been requested by R. Hare. Members of the committee had been told that they could share information from the committee with their constituents.

b) From the President

President Ivany spoke to one item only; that being the confirmation of his appointment to the NSERC Council. President Ivany noted that he was pleased to serve on the Council and look forward to advancing the perspective of Acadia and other small, high quality undergraduate universities. President Ivany promised to keep the campus community apprised of any progress in the future with the NSERC Council.

c) From the Vice-President Academic

T. Herman reported that it had been a busy time in the departments and schools and provided a short overview of highlights from some of the units on campus. In the School of Business, the Shaw Group Business Case Competition was held recently. Four teams of students were given 24 hours to solve a case and make presentations to a panel of judges, and the winning team received \$1000.00. T. Herman noted that students and teams from the School of Business were also successful when competing at the Enactus Canada Regional Exposition – Atlantic Canada. Students showcased their community empowerment projects and business ventures, and were winners in the *2013 Scotia Bank Eco Living Green Challenge*. Michael Craig, an Acadia University student who also owns a business, was named a regional champion in the Student Entrepreneur National Competition.

T. Herman reported on the success of the Experience Acadia Day, which attracted over 200 students to campus. T. Herman quoted from D. Sears that “Friday was a great day to be a professor in the School of Business at Acadia”. In addition to holding events for Experience Acadia Day, an afternoon marketing conference called “Disrupt 13” was conceived and organized during the afternoon by the students in the School of Business. T. Herman noted that the keynote speaker was Hope Bagozzi from MacDonalds.

T. Herman also profiled the Faculty of Arts, and reported that at the recent East Coast Music Awards, two faculty members from the School of Music received awards. D. Charke won the award for “Classical Composition of the Year” for his work “*Between the shore and the ships*”, and both D. Charke and S. Naylor were featured composers on the winning "Classical Recording of the Year," which featured a selection of pieces that were originally commissioned as part of the School of Music's *Shattering the Silence* New Music Festival.

T. Herman noted that in the Faculty of Science, the Huggins Science Seminar proved to be an exceptional evening with Brian Skerry, a photographer and photo-journalist. T. Herman noted that HSH 10 was at capacity for a riveting presentation. T. Herman acknowledged P. Williams and P. Davis for their hard work in promoting and organizing the event, and noted that Brian Skerry offered a second talk for students the following day that was equally impressive.

T. Herman stated that similar numbers turned out for the Bank of Montreal

Lecture which was held in BAC 241, and that although the room was airless, the presentation by Dominick Salvatore was excellent.

Finally, T. Herman was pleased to report the creation of a new student bursary that would be funded by the Blomidon Naturalists Society.

4) Time-Sensitive Issues:

- a) Approval of candidates for Honorary Degree and Professor Emeritus distinctions (*attached*)

Motion that Senate approve the candidates for Honorary Degrees and the Professor Emeritus distinctions. Moved by President Ivany, seconded by H. Gardner.

President Ivany spoke to the motion and noted that the committee was pleased with the quality of the candidates in both categories, noting especially the faculty candidates for Professor Emeritus. President Ivany noted that in the area of Honorary Degree candidates, the committee received 10 nominations. President Ivany explained that while an open call for nominations is conducted each year, nominations from the previous three years were also re-considered, so that there were several chances of being selected. President Ivany also noted the strong unanimity on the committee for the recommendations.

Ballots were circulated by R. Jotcham and P. Doerr.

President Ivany reported that J. Hennessy had requested a formal celebration of those professors receiving Professor Emeritus distinction last year, and noted that T. Herman had found a way to incorporate that celebration into the Convocation Ceremony last year, and that this will be an on-going event at Convocation each year.

Nominations for Honorary Degree were as follows:

D. Divinity	Rev. Dr. Pierre Michel Allard
D. Humanities	Elder Elsie Charles-Basque
D. Literature	Mr. Harry Thurston

Nominations for Professor Emeritus distinction were as follows:

Dr. Wendy Bedingfield
Dr. Kurt Bowen
Dr. Brenda Robertson
Dr. James Sacouman

The Chair asked to proceed with business while the ballots were being counted, and at a later point in the meeting the Chair announced that Senate had voted in favour of all nominations for both the Honorary Degrees and the Professor Emeritus distinction.

MOTION CARRIED.

5) Carried Forward from Senate meeting of February 11th, 2013

- a) Annual Review of the Functioning of the Tenure

The Chair noted that a written report from the TITCAC had been circulated to Senate and asked A. Quema to speak to the report.

Track Teaching
Complement Allocation
Committee (*attached*)

A. Quema stated that she would be a brief and succinct as possible and noted that the first part of the report reminded Senate of the context of the TTTCAC and of the terms of the original motion that was approved by Senate in June 2012. A. Quema went on to describe the activities of the committee as it worked through a number of differing proposals that emerged through discussion, and detailed the dates that different proposals were decided upon. A. Quema also noted that P. Dimock (Assistant Registrar) provided the committee with data on the 31st January, 2013, as she was required to do.

A. Quema noted that on December 14th, 2012, the new proposal that emerged was that the Deans would consult with their respective faculties to discuss the role of the TTTCAC.

The Deans were asked to provide feedback.

H. Hemming stated that in the Faculty of Professional Studies she met with the three Directors to discuss whether the process worked. H. Hemming reported that none of the directors felt that the process worked and that it only rooted them in the history of programs, rather than helping Acadia and the Academic Sector to move forward. There was a feeling amongst the directors that the approach needed to be modified.

P. Williams reported that he found there to be a very similar response in the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science when talking to the Heads and Directors.

B. Moody made the same observation from the Faculty of Arts, but also noted that the Faculty felt some reluctance in allowing the TTTCAC to deviate from the ranking that the Faculty of Arts would send forward.

P. Williams added that the various units very much appreciated being asked to provide input to the committee.

A. Quema asked whether any other TTTCAC members would like to contribute to the discussion, and also noted that the committee would be meeting again on Thursday to discuss the process further. A. Quema stated that if there were further recommendations for changes, the committee would bring them forward for discussion in the future.

b) Report from the Senate
Honours Committee
regarding Honours Forum
(*attached*)

The Chair noted that this item was placed on the agenda by D. MacKinnon. As he was not present, the item was removed from the agenda.

6) New Business

a) Motion from the By-
Laws Committee
regarding Senate
Committee
Membership (*attached*)

Motion that it be resolved that representation on all Standing Senate Committees be limited to one member per faculty, unless otherwise indicated in a formal response showing a clear rationale that a more robust membership is required to carry out the mandate and duties required of the committee. Written responses may be submitted to the Chair of the By-Laws Committee on or before May 31, 2013.

The Chair read the motion that had been circulated to Senators and informed H. Kitchin that at that point she still 'owned' the motion and could make changes if she wished to.

H. Kitchin indicated that she would like to change the wording of the motion to:

Motion that it be resolved that representation on all Standing Senate Committees be limited to one *elected* member per Faculty, unless otherwise indicated in a formal response showing a clear rationale that a more robust membership is required to carry out the mandate and duties required of the committee. *The overall committee structures would otherwise remain the same as currently constituted.* Written responses may be submitted to the Chair of the By-Laws Committee on or before May 31, 2013. Moved by H. Kitchin, seconded by W. Brackney.

H. Kitchin detailed the reasons for the proposed change, noting that with the breadth of Senate Committees and the reduced number of full-time faculty teaching often teaching larger classes, there was a need to evaluate the number of committees of Senate and the required committee complements. H. Kitchin noted that the By-Laws Committee had been tasked with assessing whether there were currently too many Senate Standing Committees, and whether the membership requirements for some of the committees could be streamlined.

J. Hennessy stated that he was Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee and asked how the reduction in elected faculty members would take effect, as on that committee there was one Senator and one non-Senator from each faculty. Would the Senator stay, or the non-Senator? Who would nominate and elect the individuals?

H. Kitchin responded that few committees had that structure; the committee could make recommendations as to what they thought would be the best configuration.

The Chair explained that this motion was only to see whether Senate agreed with the basic principle; formal changes to the By-laws would still need to be made for each committee. Nominations and elections would proceed as is current practice: through the Senate Nominating Committee for Senators, or through the Faculty Elections Officers for general members of Faculty.

A. Quema pointed out that in looking at the various Senate committees, she could see that both Senators and faculty members were on the Senate Nominating Committee. In the case of the Curriculum Committee, A. Quema stated that she would have concerns if the membership was reduced to one faculty member from each Faculty because of the scope and intensity of the work involved.

H. Kitchin responded that the caveat would always be that if additional faculty were felt to be essential to the workings of a committee, a request just needed to be put to the By-Laws Committee.

B. Latta asked whether in the case of faculty numbers being reduced on a committee; the number of Administration or ex-officio members would also

be reduced.

H. Kitchin stated that most of the Administration committee members were ex-officio.

The Chair noted that ex officio members were still voting members of committees unless otherwise noted; therefore the proposed change would change the ratio of faculty members to administrative or student members. The Chair also asked when this proposal would go into effect.

H. Kitchin stated that the change could go into effect immediately (i.e., for the upcoming academic year), but that there would be an understanding that as members' terms expired, they would either be replaced, or not replaced, depending on the number of elected representatives of faculty that were remaining on the respective committee.

P. Williams asked for clarification as to whether the motion stated "*limited to one elected member per Faculty*" and H. Kitchin agreed that the wording stated that.

Andrew Mitchell asked which committees would be exempt from this ruling. He gave the example of the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee which had several student reps, plus two ex-officio members. The committee currently had two faculty members for each Faculty, plus the Registrar and the Chair. A. Mitchell noted that this change would significantly alter the student to faculty ratio on the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee.

The Chair noted that at this point this was a proposal coming to Senate to see whether Senators liked the idea. Actual changes in membership would not go into effect until formal changes to the By-laws were approved.

Motion to refer the issue back to the By-Laws Committee. Moved by P. Hobson and seconded by P. Doerr.

H. Kitchin responded that if the matter went back to the By-Laws Committee, committees would be continuing to do what they were presently doing with no reduction in membership.

M. Rios asked how hard it was to find faculty to serve on these committees.

H. Kitchin explained that the reason the issue came to the By-Laws Committee in the first place was because it was proving so difficult to place faculty on these committees.

J. Hennessy agreed that it was an issue, but felt that it would be more fruitful for the By-Laws Committee to come to Senate with specific recommendations for individual committees.

H. Kitchin reminded Senate that the By-Laws Committee requested feedback, but had received no input from Senators.

A. Quema suggested that the By-Laws Committee go through the committee structures and decide which committees could alter their faculty membership without proving detrimental to the working of the committee.

B. Anderson felt that the Chair of each Senate committee should give instructions to the By-Laws Committee, and suggested that another call be put

out to the committees, with a request for feedback.

D. Benoit noted that if the By-Laws could identify committees that had no active Chair, or were not meeting regularly, it would be useful to speak to Senators or faculty members that had served on the particular committees in the past, to see if they were able to provide relevant information and feedback.

The Chair asked whether Senators were in favour of referring the matter back to the By-Laws Committee.

MOTION TO REFER BACK TO COMMITTEE CARRIED. Motion that be it resolved that, while remaining a 'Committee' and maintaining its current delineation of duties, and its reporting structure to Senate, the Senate Timetable, Instruction Hours and Examination Committee, be constituted solely by the Registrar, or the Registrar's delegate. Moved by H. Kitchin and seconded by B. Anderson.

H. Kitchin spoke to the motion and acknowledged that the work of the committee is almost all done by the Registrar's Office. The By-Laws committee felt that it would be prudent to have this committee served only by the Registrar or the Registrar's delegate, and to remove the three faculty members from the committee.

B. Anderson addressed concerns that the committee could be maintained with only the Registrar or Registrar's delegate serving. It was noted that it would still be a committee and still report to Senate, and that other organisations work in this manner.

J. Hennessy agreed that it made sense to have the Registrar be essentially 'the committee', but asked whether the Registrar would then bring a report to Senate, along with recommendations.

A. Quema noted the requirement for the committee to communicate and recommend to Senate and asked whether there should in fact be a committee to carry out the work.

The Chair read out to Senate the current duties of the committee.

R. Jotcham noted that the committee had not met for several years.

J. Hennessy commented that the committee was not performing its mandate at present.

M. Rios noted that decisions often refer back to various committees from Senate and that the best decisions are not all made on the floor of Senate. He also noted that there are students on the committee at present.

H. Kitchin stated that the reality was that one person on the committee did a lot, and that person was the Registrar's delegate. The mandate should be left as it was.

R. Jotcham explained that in developing the Calendar dates, wide consultation was carried out with numerous individuals on campus. The publishing of the examination timetable and the course timetable also required significant consultation, but primarily drew on staff resources and expertise in the Registrar's Office. R. Jotcham was concerned that although the committee did

not meet presently, how would items of substance that she might bring to Senate be handled? R. Jotcham wondered what mechanism would be in place to allow the committee to get larger if need be.

The Chair stated that the current membership included the Registrar or Delegate, and that this could become 'Registrar or Delegate(s)'. The Registrar could then add additional people as resources to the committee as required. However, the Chair noted that this wording would leave it up to the Registrar as to who would serve on the committee for any given issue.

A. Quema voiced concerns because she was not in favour of getting rid of certain committees. A. Quema noted that By-Laws were a means of establishing processes according to the principles of democracy. A. Quema felt that because reduced complement was putting faculty under pressure, the decision had been made to reduce the number of faculty on various committees, but that this was not the way that democracy should work.

M. Rios asked R. Jotcham whether the consultation process went through the committee, or whether it was a part of her job description.

R. Jotcham responded that in practice, consultation did not go through the committee, nor was it detailed in her job description. All consultation went through the Registrar's Office.

D. Benoit noted that he had served on this committee in the past and felt that the committee should be carrying out its mandate. D. Benoit felt that in this case the TI&E Committee was not doing its job. D. Benoit gave for an example point (6) of the committee duties "*to make recommendations concerning any changes in the scheduling of courses which, in its judgement, will more efficiently utilize the physical plant of the university without compromising academic needs*" and asked how faculty would make these sorts of requests if only the Registrar was on the committee.

The Chair responded that it would continue to be a committee, even if only the Registrar or the Registrar's Delegate(s) served; recommendations could still be brought to Senate for approval, or Senate could still refer matters to the committee.

P. Williams suggested taking a careful look at the mandate and stated that substantive issues could get placed on the back burner if everything was handled in the Registrar's Office.

Question was called.

MOTION DEFEATED.

The Chair reminded Senate that despite a motion approved by Senate in March 2010 that students' minors would be noted on their transcripts, this action had never been implemented. The Chair asked T. Herman to speak to the issue.

T. Herman explained to Senate that to implement the programming changes on the Eden system would take a full month of programming to achieve. T. Herman noted that the Advancement Datatel project was nearing an end, but

b) Minors on Transcripts that as a result, there was a large backlog of programming requests from all across the campus, which resulted in a difficult timing issue.

T. Herman stated that an upgrade to Eden at a time when the software was nearing the end of its life would not make a lot of sense, and that the university was reluctant to invest a large amount of time and money into the programming fix at this time.

R. Jotcham stated that the issue of minors on transcripts was only one of many jobs that were in the queue, and that considerable analysis would be required to see how successful a programming change could actually be.

D. Shea asked when the Eden system would be replaced.

T. Herman acknowledged that this was the million dollar question and that this was an unknown, because a decision of this nature would involve a great deal of time and money.

S. Lochhead added that once the decision was taken there would have to be a very large financial commitment on the part of the university.

D. Benoit asked whether the university had currently decided on another software package.

President Ivany confirmed that the university had not done so yet, and that any final decision on software packages would be further out.

A. Quema asked whether in view of what was at stake, could this not be made a priority?

President Ivany responded that this would be a large expenditure, and a multi-year expenditure, so that it would take some lead time.

The Chair commented that Eden currently had one system that ran transcripts and one that ran PACEs.

R. Jotcham explained that the minor information would have to be stripped out of Eden every time anyone needed to run a PACE. This would coincide with the crucial time right before graduation when hundreds of PACEs were being run.

J. Hennessy stated that all courses are listed on the transcript. If another institute considered the courses that had been taken to constitute a minor then there should be no problem.

B. Anderson stated that this motion was passed by Senate three years ago and was known to be important to the students. The lack of a minor showing on transcripts for inter-disciplinary studies continued to cause problems for the programs.

M. Rios stated that the students value their degrees and want to be able to show their minor on the transcript.

P. Doerr was asked to assume the Chair as D. Holmberg left the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

D. Benoit discussed a Banner suite of software developed by Ellucian and noted that IBM was keen to offer this software on the Acadia campus. D. Benoit felt that the university could ask IBM to host this Banner technology. D. Benoit also noted that in the past the university used to make extensive use of co-op student placements for assistance with technical jobs such as software re-design.

A. Quema supported D. Benoit's statements.

T. Herman thanked D. Benoit for the suggestions and agreed that the Banner software could be worth considering.

- c) Motion from the Academic Planning Committee regarding endorsement of a renewed articulation of "An Acadia Education" as a planning goal" *(attached)*

Motion from Academic Planning Committee

In an effort to help guide academic and institutional planning moving forward, the APC grounded its initial planning considerations in the University Strategic Plan. The plan was used by the APC to identify and articulate an overarching goal or 'end state' to which our planning efforts would be oriented. In its considerations, the APC was particularly drawn to the Mission statement and the description of "An Acadia Education". While the APC found that the Mission remains relevant, compelling and current, the APC also concluded that it needed to explicitly identify the key components of an Acadia Education, as these were considered to be at the heart of the APC's efforts. The APC felt that the best way to do this was through a re-statement and expansion of the existing description. Consequently, the APC offers this renewed articulation of an "Acadia Education" (as presented in Appendix A of the APC Report to Senate, Feb 11, 2013) and submits it in the form of a tangible end state and goal for all of the university to strive towards. The APC respectfully requests that Senate endorses this submission.

A. An Acadia education:

- 1. Is rigorous and liberal and requires students to gain knowledge and understanding across and within disciplines.**
- 2. Focuses on the whole student and fosters healthy academic, social, and residential experiences to develop well-rounded critical thinkers, engaged citizens, and lifelong learners.**

B. To accomplish this, an Acadia education:

- 1. Is personalized in that students and faculty build close educational relationships that foster critical thinking, deep understanding, and attitudes of lifelong learning.**
- 2. Encompasses a variety of curricular and extracurricular experiences that develop engagement with community and society on the principles of modern citizenship, ethical decision-making, and accountability.**
- 3. Emphasises the importance of understanding the environment in all its forms.**
- 4. Promotes student participation in research in order to enhance their critical thinking and analytical reasoning and to foster their understanding that research plays a crucial role in the growth and development of all aspects of our world.**

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

T. Herman spoke to the motion for the Academic Planning Committee and stated that the committee was aiming to guide the academic planning process. The committee, in its deliberations, had been drawn to the mission statement (page four of the Strategic Planning document).

T. Herman stated that the Academic Planning Committee felt that the mission statement remained quite relevant, but also felt that there was a need to be more explicit in describing an 'Acadia Education'. The committee was therefore offering a slightly different articulation of an 'Acadia Education', which it considered to be in the form of a more tangible end state and goal for all of the university to strive towards.

T. Herman also explained that the four items in Section B would provide an overarching mechanism of how Section A would be achieved.

P. Williams added that if this was where Acadia wanted to go, this was how it would get there.

P. Hobson felt that under Section B, points 2, 3 and 4 moved the statement from the general to the specific. Section B, point 1 covered personalized education and P. Hobson felt that points 3 and 4 did not need to be included.

H. Kitchin stated that she was still up to date with the data that had been collected from the units and schools by the APPC, and that she perceived a certain amount of APC "mission creep". H. Kitchin asked what the overall intent of the APC was, and questioned the authority of the APC to re-write the Strategic Plan.

H. Kitchin read out the existing mandate of the APC, and stated that any recommendation to re-write the Strategic Plan would need to be the result of widespread consultation with the campus community. H. Kitchin felt that the APC was out of order in making a recommendation to Senate at this time. H. Kitchin felt that this set up an inequitable situation where some units would be able to do things better than others.

T. Herman disagreed with H. Kitchin's view of the mandate of the APC and felt that this was no more than a re-clarification of an end-state. T. Herman also noted that there would be additional motions coming to Senate from the APC.

A. Quema reviewed the wording of the Strategic Plan and asked where the new wording would be inserted, and whether it would go under an 'Acadia Education' in the Strategic Plan. A. Quema felt that the APC would make recommendations, but was concerned that broad consultation had already taken place, and that the Strategic Plan was developed as a result of those broad consultations.

J. Hennessy felt that there was a dissonance between the liberal arts university and units such as Music, because students in the Music program tended not to cross disciplines, as their course offerings were very specific to Music.

A. Quema asked where the changed wording would go in the Strategic Plan.

T. Herman responded that this was a restatement of the 'Acadia Experience' and was intended as a stand-alone document that the committee had put together after examining the wording in the Strategic Plan.

H. Kitchin asked whether this document would not be part of the Strategic Plan.

T. Herman responded that this was just an articulation of what the Academic Planning Committee felt an 'Acadia Education' road map should be.

P. Hobson suggested a friendly amendment and the Chair responded that Senators could only bring amendments to the motion.

Motion to move the text around in the original motion and to strike points B. 3 and 4. The wording 'analytical reasoning' in B. 4 would move into point A. 2. Moved by P. Hobson, seconded by W. Slights.

The amended motion would now read:

A. An Acadia education:

- 1. Is rigorous and liberal and requires students to gain knowledge and understanding across and within disciplines.**
- 2. Focuses on the whole student and fosters healthy academic, social, and residential experiences to develop analytical reasoning, well-rounded critical thinkers, engaged citizens, and lifelong learners.**

B. To accomplish this, an Acadia education:

- 1. Is personalized in that students and faculty build close educational relationships that foster critical thinking, deep understanding, and attitudes of lifelong learning.**
- 2. Encompasses a variety of curricular and extracurricular experiences that develop engagement with community and society on the principles of modern citizenship, ethical decision-making, and accountability.**

D. Benoit agreed that point B. 3 was easier for some schools or units than others and did not have a problem with striking point 3 from the document.

D. Benoit did not feel that point B. 4 should be struck from the list.

S. Major asked the Chair whether the amendment could be split into two parts.

The Chair responded that it could not at that time.

T. Herman argued that point B. 4 should remain in the document. T. Herman also felt that point B. 3, the term 'environment in all its forms', should continue to be incorporated into the document. T. Herman noted that the sense of place here was important.

J. Hennessy proposed that point B. 4 could be expanded to include 'critical thinking and analytical reasoning, *and creativity*.'

J. Guiney Yallop suggested that in point B. 3 the word 'environment' could be pluralised to say 'Emphasises the importance of understanding *environments in all of their forms*'. J. Guiney Yallop also felt that more time and discussion was needed to provide adequate clarity, and requested that Senate defer making a decision on the amendment to the motion.

Motion that the issue be referred back to the committee. Moved by J. MacLeod, seconded by H. Kitchin.

MOTION TO REFER BACK TO COMMITTEE APPROVED.

7) Adjournment

It being 6:00 p.m., the Chair called for a motion to adjourn. Moved by S. Hewitt.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

FEBRUARY 2013 REPORT FROM THE TTTCAC

This is a report on the TTTCAC's activities since November 2012. Most of the activities revolved around a decision that Senate took last spring.

CONTEXT

- In June 2012, Senate approved the motion that the By-Law describing the mandate and operating procedure of the TTTCAC would 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

- On November 13, the Chair of the TTTCAC worded revisions and circulated them by email to the Committee.
- On 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.
- On December 14, the TTTCAC met to discuss this new proposal. In the course of the discussion, yet another proposal emerged. The outcome of this meeting was that the Deans would consult their respective faculties to discuss this proposal.
- On December 18, the Chair circulated the minutes of the meeting to the Committee.
- On 31 January 2013, P. Dimock provided the data from the Registrar's Office.

Anne Quéma, chair of the TTTCAC

A brief report on the Honours Forum
(April 5 and 6, 2011)

Senate Honours Committee

The forum discussed the benefits of the honours program for students and faculty members. An overview of responses:

Students' viewpoint. The honours program means (1) a higher degree of disciplinary focus than an undergraduate degree with a specific major; (2) the development of an in-depth research project, problem solving skills, and critical thinking; and (3) it encourages freedom of thinking, i.e., students are writing deeply, and not just thinking about “getting it done.”

Faculty members' perspective. Many faculty members feel that (1) it is rewarding to work with students at a higher level than through regular course work; (2) that tracking the success of students - especially those continuing on to graduate school – is a way of demonstrating the success of programs in the academic/professional community; and (3) students are engaged in research, which sometimes results in joint publications.

Forum participants were also asked to comment on the ideal thesis process, what an Acadia honours degree means to the rest of the academic world, and whether there is a way to “brand” it as an Acadia product.

Regarding the “the ideal thesis process”, several issues were raised in the forum.

1. **The entry level of the students for the honours program** –forum participants discussed GPA requirements, time of entry in the honours program (e.g., at the beginning/end of 2nd or 3rd year), and writing skills. The Senate Honours Committee (SHC) is currently discussing this issue.
2. **Thesis proposal** –forum members suggested that a proposal is essential. The current SHC is discussing a format of the proposal that can be used by all faculties at the university and the timeline for submitting the proposal to R&GS.
3. **Thesis submission date** – forum participants agreed that under normal circumstances the submission date should be kept before the beginning of the exam period, which will allow sufficient time for a proper review process.
4. **Examination and Grading** – the forum members showed strong support for the close involvement of the second reader in the honours thesis. It was pointed out the second reader should be empowered to assign a (number) grade to the thesis, and perhaps, the second reader's name should also appear on the completed thesis along with the department head and supervisor(s). It turns out that the grading scheme varies from unit to unit. A few departments and schools have formal grading schemes that may or may not involve the second reader, whereas other units do not. The SHC is discussing this issue and will explore the feasibility of making the grading scheme more formal (i.e., grade distribution over the proposal, research, writing, and oral presentation (if any) by the supervisor and the reviewers).
5. **Role of the external reader** – the forum participants showed strong support for the external readers. There was some discussion on who would be an ideal external reader and the time constraints in getting thorough the external review process. The SHC agrees that the current external review process for the honours thesis is not very efficient in terms of utilizing the reviewer's time and expertise. Forum participants suggested selecting externals from a cognate department. The SHC noted that the survey conducted by a previous SHC also showed some dissatisfaction with the external review process. The SHC is discussing possible modifications to the external review process.

We are discussing the issues listed above, and will report the outcomes of our discussion as soon as we have something substantial. The information presented on the honours forum held in April 2011 is based on the notes and summary prepared by the previous Honours Committee chair (Dr. Sonia Hewitt).
Senate Honours Committee (Chair)

Pritam Ranjan

(Date: March 02, 2012)

FROM the SENATE BY-LAWS COMMITTEE TO SENATE

March 11, 2013

Committee Members:

Heather A. Kitchin (Arts), Chair

Barb Anderson (Science), Secretary

William Brackney (Theology)

Jim MacLeod (Professional Studies)

The Senate By-Laws Committee has been tasked with assessing: [a] whether there are currently too many Senate Standing Committees; and [b] whether the membership requirements for some of the Committees can be streamlined in size.

Given the breadth of Senate Committees, the reduced number of full-time faculty, plus larger class sizes (resulting in greater commitments elsewhere), the number of committees and the required committee complements is being evaluated, through an iterative process, by the Senate By-Laws Committee.

As a first step in this incremental process, and only after extensive consideration of these issues, the Senate By-Laws Committee proposes the following two motions:

1. Be it resolved that representation on all Standing Senate Committees be limited to one member per faculty, unless otherwise indicated in a formal response showing a clear rationale that a more robust membership is required to carry of the mandate and duties required of the committee. Written responses may be submitted to the Chair of the By-Laws Committee on or before May 31, 2013.
2. Be it resolved that, while remaining a 'Committee' and maintaining its current delineation of duties, and its reporting structure to Senate, the Senate Timetable, Instruction Hours and Examination Committee, be constituted solely by the Registrar, or the Registrar's delegate.

Motion from Academic Planning Committee

In an effort to help guide academic and institutional planning moving forward, the APC grounded its initial planning considerations in the University Strategic Plan. The plan was used by the APC to identify and articulate an overarching goal or 'end state' to which our planning efforts would be oriented. In its considerations, the APC was particularly drawn to the Mission statement and the description of "An Acadia Education". While the APC found that the Mission remains relevant, compelling and current, the APC also concluded that it needed to explicitly identify the key components of an Acadia Education, as these were considered to be at the heart of the APC's efforts. The APC felt that the best way to do this was through a re-statement and expansion of the existing description. Consequently, the APC offers this renewed articulation of an "Acadia Education" (as presented in Appendix A of the APC Report to Senate, Feb 11, 2013) and submits it in the form of a tangible end state and goal for all of the university to strive towards. The APC respectfully requests that Senate endorses this submission.

A. An Acadia education:

1. Is rigorous and liberal and requires students to gain knowledge and understanding across and within disciplines.
2. Focuses on the whole student and fosters healthy academic, social, and residential experiences to develop well-rounded critical thinkers, engaged citizens, and lifelong learners.

B. To accomplish this, an Acadia education:

1. Is personalized in that students and faculty build close educational relationships that foster critical thinking, deep understanding, and attitudes of lifelong learning.
2. Encompasses a variety of curricular and extracurricular experiences that develop engagement with community and society on the principles of modern citizenship, ethical decision-making, and accountability.
3. Emphasises the importance of understanding the environment in all its forms.
4. Promotes student participation in research in order to enhance their critical thinking and analytical reasoning and to foster their understanding that research plays a crucial role in the growth and development of all aspects of our world.

T. Herman, Chair, APC
March 4, 2013