



Minutes of the Senate meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> April 2013.

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> April, 2013 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 50 present.

- 1) Approval of Agenda
- The Chair requested a minor adjustment to the agenda before it was approved, with a request that under 5)a) the phrase '*amendment under consideration*' be struck from the agenda, as it was in error. The Chair noted that at the March meeting, the digital recording had failed to work.

**Motion to approve the agenda moved by R. Seale, seconded by B. Moody.**

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

MOTION TO APPROVE THE REVISED AGENDA CARRIED.

- 2) Minutes of the Meeting of  
11<sup>th</sup> March, 2013

**Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 11<sup>th</sup> March as distributed.  
Moved by W. Brackney, seconded by D. MacKinnon.**

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

J. Hennessy requested that on page 11 the sentence '*J. Hennessy noted that the specific degrees needed to remain*' be struck from the minutes.

D. Benoit requested that on page 10, the word '*INB*' be replaced with IBM in two places.

A. Quema asked that on page 4, paragraph 3, the wording be changed to state '*.. the new proposal that emerged was that the Deans would consult with their respective faculties to discuss the role of the TTTCAC.*

MOTION TO APPROVE THE REVISED MINUTES CARRIED.

- 3) Announcements  
a) From the Chair of Senate

Regrets were received from R. Murphy, P. Williams and H. Gardner. The Chair also noted that R. Worvill would be arriving late.

The Chair welcomed everyone and welcomed Christianne Rushton from the School of Music, who was attending Senate as a guest, as she would be replacing J. Hennessy on Senate during 2013-14. There were no objections to C. Rushton attending.

The Chair noted that the next meeting of senate would be the 'Annual' meeting of Senate and as a result Senators would see a call for brief annual reports from the committees of Senate. There would also be calls for nominees to serve on Senate committees. The Chair recognized that faculty were overburdened but still asked that they step up and serve on committees, many of which did important work. The Chair noted that until such time as the By Laws were changed to simplify the committee structures, committee membership would continue unchanged. The Chair encouraged Senators to get themselves onto committees if there were particular things they would like to see changed.

**b) From the President**

President Ivany reported that the compressed natural gas project had come to fruition and that once fully implemented this would offer savings that would allow resources to be directed back to the university and into the academic sector.

President Ivany noted that the MOU process was continuing steadily.

President Ivany discussed the Partnership Council - noting that a couple of different levels existed within the MOU structure. Acadia was on a smaller steering committee, along with St. F.X., Saint Mary's, and Dalhousie; and also a larger Partnership Council that included all University Presidents and five Government deputies. The larger Council would be meeting in April for a workshop. President Ivany noted that the workshop included presentations by Matthew Pellish, Education Advisory Board and Dr. Harvey Weingarten, Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO). The President noted that the workshop would include a further exploration of what sort of collaboration could come out of the government and university dialogue that was embedded in the MOU.

The President noted that while he was pleased with the progress that had been made with regards to the Excellence and Innovation Fund submissions, he noted that the major piece relating to the MOU was the funding formula, and that was still pending.

K. Power asked about the common application process that was announced recently.

President Ivany responded that the common application portal was an initiative of the Government. President Ivany noted that Acadia's approach to the application process, with a personalised response to applicants, worked very well at present, and that it was not clear whether that sort of approach would be able to continue in a common application portal. President Ivany noted that there will be a consultative process with the institutions around this issue.

D. Benoit asked about the timeline for the compressed natural gas conversion.

President Ivany noted that the zoning process still needed to be completed with the Town of Wolfville. Although September was the target, President Ivany felt that January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014 was the more likely scenario, since certain items like zoning changes were beyond the control of the university.

L. Aylward asked what process was being used with respect to the MOU, to decide on a process.

President Ivany agreed that there was no straightforward answer in that the MOU was not explicit in that regard. These were resource allocation decisions, so that the universities would be allowed some input and involvement, but that at the end of the day the Government would be the one making the final decisions.

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

T. Herman reported that six students from Recreation Management were in India as part of their Core term experience, working in community development. The students were currently in Delhi working with NGO's but moving on to a village called Munsyari in the Himalayas shortly. Students were working on eco-tourism development and living with families in the village.

Political Science students hosted a conference recently called Technology, Culture and Social Change. Over 20 students from across Canada attended; a talk was given by Imray Seaman, a CRC in Cultural Studies from the University of Alberta. T. Herman noted that the department of Politics and other departments in the Faculty of Arts chaired sessions and offered other support.

T. Herman reported that Sabrina Hiefer, a second year student in Engineering, had been offered a significant scholarship from the Canadian Engineering Memorial Foundation. The 'Women in Engineering Scholarship' would allow Sabrina to attend a National Engineering conference in Yellowknife and also to serve as a mentor and provide presentations to high school students interested in engineering.

T. Herman noted that the Harrison McCain awards had been decided recently and that once again there was a very strong array of applicants in all three categories. T. Herman noted that there will be an announcement of the successful applicants shortly.

T. Herman reported that on the NSERC front, six of the nine applications to the 2013 Discovery Grants were successful. T. Herman thanked D. MacKinnon and Research and Graduate Studies for their efforts in mentoring and preparation of submissions.

**4) Time-Sensitive Issues:**

**a) Approval of candidates for Honorary Degrees (*attached*)**

**Motion that Senate approve the three candidates for Honorary Degrees. Moved by President Ivany, seconded by M Rios.**

President Ivany spoke to the motion and noted that these nominations came out of the usual sequence. The Chemistry department was celebrating its 100 year anniversary and was bringing forward two outstanding individuals for consideration. President Ivany noted that the nominations had been approved by the Honorary Awards Committee.

**b) Honorary Degree Nomination for Science**

President Ivany noted that the committee had also looked back through past nominations to nominate T. Raddall and were unanimous with the recommendation.

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

Nominations for Honorary Degree were as follows:

D. Science     Hermes Chan  
D. Science     Dr. Abdullah Kirumira  
D. Science     Dr. Thomas Raddall II

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 the Honorary Degrees.

MOTION CARRIED.

- c) Nominations for Chair and Deputy Chair of Senate     The Chair explained that nominations for these positions would be announced in April for election at the May meeting of Senate.

J. Hennessy stated that the Nominating Committee had put out a call for nominations for Chair and Deputy Chair of Senate. D. Holmberg was nominated as Chair for 2013-14. S. Henderson was nominated as Deputy Chair.

- 5) Carried Forward from Senate meeting of March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013

- a) Motion from the Academic Planning Committee regarding endorsement of a renewed articulation of “An Acadia Education” as a planning goal (*attached*)     The Chair reminded Senators that P. Hobson had an amendment to the original motion under consideration, but that at the end of the meeting J. MacLeod moved that the issue be referred back to the APC. The Chair stated that the committee could now do whatever it felt would best address concerns and move the issue forward; it was not necessarily bound to incorporate the amendment under consideration at the time of referral.

T. Herman noted that a revised motion had been circulated. T. Herman stated that the APC felt strongly that the current mission statement was both relevant and compelling, but also felt that they should explicitly identify the components of an Acadia education, which was best done by restating and expanding the description of an Acadia education. Senate was asked to approve the submission as guidance for academic planning at Acadia. This was not an attempt to re-write the Acadia Strategic Plan.

T. Herman read out the wording in the motion that had been changed as a result of feedback at the previous Senate meeting.

T. Herman noted that the APC felt strongly that points 3) and 4) should continue to be included in the motion.

**Motion to substitute the revised motion as circulated, for the original motion. Moved by T. Herman, seconded by B. Moody.**

The Chair explained that if the motion to substitute was passed, discussion would continue with the new, revised motion.

MOTION TO SUBSTITUTE THE REVISED MOTION APPROVED.

A discussion about the revised motion now followed.

W. Slights commented that the statement in B. 1 appeared fuzzy and lacked direction, and felt that it did not give a clear picture of the sort of education that a student might expect at Acadia. W. Slights felt that the intention was to highlight the difference between studying at Acadia or for example, going to the University of Toronto, noting that there was something special about Acadia.

J. Banks joined the Senate meeting.

W. Slights requested an amendment to the wording of the document.

**Motion to alter the wording in B.1 to read ‘*An Acadia education offers small classes taught by tenure track faculty*’. Moved by W. Slights, seconded by P. Hobson.**

A. Foster pointed out that not all professors were tenure track.

E. Callaghan was comfortable with the existing wording and noted that in order to accomplish what A.1 and A.2 described, it was not always necessary to have small classes. E. Callaghan also wondered what a definition of ‘small’ would be.

J. MacLeod felt that the wording of the amendment was too restrictive, as it would make it hard for sessional appointees who would often be covering for tenured faculty on leave.

A. Quema stated that in an attempt to solve a problem, another level of hierarchy was in danger of being created. A. Quema felt that she could not support the language in the amendment.

J. Hennessy also noted that in the Music program, many instrument classes were taught by part time faculty, so that the proposed change would not work for Music.

H. Kitchin understood W. Slights’ concern with the ‘fuzzy’ language, but also noted that this language would imply that Acadia did not have larger classes, whereas in fact Acadia did offer a number of larger classes.

P. Hobson affirmed his support for the amendment. P. Hobson felt that the motion from the APC was circular and vague. P. Hobson felt that W. Slights had answered the question of how one went about building close educational relationships that fostered critical thinking.

A. Vibert felt that the key issue was a principle, and that Senate was arguing about the best means to achieving that principle. There might be a variety of different perspectives on how a personalized education was established. Senate could commit to the principle of a personalized education without all having to agree on the precise mechanisms.

L. Aylward noted that she would not expect to see language from the Collective Agreement or working conditions detailed in a document such as

this one, and in general preferred systems to be more open and less restrictive.

H. Kitchin recalled that when she served on the APPC, there was a recommendation to revisit the Strategic Plan, and felt that this was not the appropriate way to do that. H. Kitchin did not believe that Senate should negotiate the language of the Strategic Plan. H. Kitchin felt that instead, Senate could be discussing a more formal process for renewing the Strategic Plan.

The Chair referred the discussion back to the amendment before Senate.

W. Slights understood that while some classes at Acadia were very large, this presented an opportunity to state an 'end state' for a direction for the university to be going in.

AMENDMENT FAILED.

J. Hennessy noted that he was one of the Senators who had issues with the original wording of B.3 and B.4, and thanked the APC for the re-wording that had come forward.

A. Quema found the wording of B.3 to be perfectly clear. A. Quema felt, however, that B.3 could just as easily be emphasizing something other than the environment and wondered why so much emphasis was being placed on the environment. If the document was to assist with planning, many faculty members had nothing directly to do with the environment.

T. Herman responded that the Strategic Plan included considerable emphasis on the environment. The committee's recommendation was to point out all facets of the environment, including the social and the cultural. There was a sense of place which was often grounded in the environment and this was a hallmark of the institution. T. Herman noted that many problems had been caused as a result of separating environments from humans. T. Herman noted that "all facets of the environment" very much involve humans. T. Herman asked other members of the APC to add their comments.

**Motion to alter the wording in B.1 '*Is personalized in that students and faculty build close educational relationships ...*' by removing the word 'close'. Moved by S. Major, seconded by H. Kitchin.**

S. Major felt that the word "close" had potentially inappropriate connotations when describing faculty-student interactions.

K. Power was uncomfortable with the word, but also noted that every institution builds educational relationships, so that the original wording did set Acadia apart.

E. Callaghan liked the wording but would consider a substitution. However, the fact that the word 'close' was followed by '*educational relationship*' did draw attention to the fact that Acadia was serious about a close educational relationship.

P. Hobson felt that the important words in the sentence were those defining what was meant by an educational relationship. P. Hobson pointed out that in China, many universities were not involved in fostering critical thinking, but were more involved in the memorization of facts by the students.

B. Anderson suggested the use of 'meaningful' instead of 'close'.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT FAILED.

L. Aylward asked whether it was an effective use of Senate time to be word-smithing when Senate was agreeing on a set of principles.

H. Kitchin questioned again why this definition had come to the floor of Senate. H. Kitchin noted that 'environment' was already in the Strategic Plan, and felt that it rested with the By Laws Committee to create a new committee to re-vamp the wording of the Strategic Plan that could then be brought to Senate.

T. Herman responded that the APPC had not felt that there was a need to re-write the Strategic Plan, but that the APC was mandated to carry out academic planning. T. Herman noted that the proposed description of an Acadia education would be used by the APC to *'identify and articulate an overarching goal or 'end state' to which our planning efforts would be oriented'*. It would allow the APC to plan effectively. T. Herman noted that the APC wanted to do its work as it had been mandated to do. T. Herman noted that the APC could not plan unilaterally, and that whatever the committee recommended, it would recommend to Senate for consideration and debate, in a transparent fashion.

I. Hutchinson spoke in favour of the motion and the efforts of the APC to reach an 'end state', noting his complete support.

H. Kitchin had concerns and stated that Acadia already had a Strategic Plan, and felt that if Senate was looking at planning, why was the Strategic Plan not being made use of to guide the planning process? H. Kitchin noted that she had serious concerns, stating that when another university completely restructured, the environment became one of four distinct themes that appeared in the restructuring.

B. Latta shared similar concerns and voiced them before needing to leave Senate early. B. Latta felt that the APC was setting policies and direction for the university, and felt that the debate around the environment was unsatisfactory.

S. MacDougall did not see this definition as contrary to the Strategic Plan, and noted that to develop a new Strategic Plan would take a great deal of time.

D. Benoit felt that there was nothing in the document that was inconsistent with the Strategic Plan, and that to pull certain themes from the Strategic Plan and to condense them down to one page was good. D. Benoit suggested that this formed the focus that the APC was working on and felt that the committee should be allowed to do their work. D. Benoit did not believe that this focus overrode the Strategic Plan that Acadia had in place.

A. Quema noted again the emphasis on the environment and felt that there was a huge difference at Acadia at the time when Acadia endorsed the Strategic Plan, because a different planning structure was in place. A. Quema noted that Acadia was at a different point now and that the committee was being asked to propose recommendations for planning. In the past, Faculties could retain a sense of autonomy or at least a sense that they could make their planning decisions. A. Quema felt that Faculties were now worried that the APC might

make recommendations that would later be regretted because a democratic process of planning was not taken into account.

There being no further speakers, the Chair asked for all in favour of the main motion that Senate endorse the revised motion.

MOTION CARRIED.

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

The Chair provided a brief background and explained that several years ago a motion to remove the external reader from honours thesis was narrowly defeated. This led to a decision to create an ad hoc committee, which proposed to hold an open forum discussion on Honours theses in 2011. The issue was then referred to the Honours Committee. The Chair noted the extent of the work that was carried out by the committee, leading up to the presentation of the report to Senate, and asked D. MacKinnon to speak to the report. The Chair also informed Senate that the report was for information purposes and that no motions were required.

D. MacKinnon apologised for the delay and noted that neither Chair of the Honours Committee sat on Senate, and as a result the report came through his office. D. MacKinnon stated that he would be happy to respond to comments or questions, but also noted that in recent years he attempted to select external readers that had a background in the thesis subject area. D. MacKinnon noted that this was a challenge in the area of Math and Statistics.

D. MacKinnon stated that when the committee looked at standardizing processes they ran into problems, as students do not progress in a standard manner. There was strong support in the forum for the external readers to continue.

S. Major asked about the thesis proposal, and whether Research and Graduate Studies would get involved in receiving thesis proposals from students.

D. MacKinnon stated that they would not.

A. Quema noted the role of the external reader as being one of an interdisciplinary one, since reading a thesis from a different subject area often proved enlightening.

6) New Business

a) Two motions from the Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee (*attached*)

A. Quema provided the context first and read out the first motion.

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

**Motion that the Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee be disbanded. Moved by A. Quema, seconded by J. Hennessy.**



The Chair explained that because taking final action on this motion would require a change in the By Laws (i.e., removing a committee) it required a 30 day Notice of Motion, which had not been given. The motion that day could not therefore be binding, it would have to be 'in principle', and serve as a Notice of Motion. At the same time, the discussion would be a useful way of assessing Senate's will on the issue. There would be no formal vote to disband the TTTCAC until the May Senate meeting.

J. Hennessy stated that he was a member of the committee and stated that the allocation of tenure track resources was one of the most important decisions that could be made across the campus; however, he felt that a number of flaws existed in the process being used. J. Hennessy described the faculty ranking process being used, noting that the committee relied on data from the Registrar's Office, which did not always properly reflect experiences in the individual units. Each unit may make a very strong case for a TT resource, but once the proposal came to the committee, it would be left to a faculty rep to make that case. J. Hennessy noted that a faculty rep would very probably be from a different unit in the Faculty, and therefore not able to appreciate all of the arguments that would be raised by the unit head or director. J. Hennessy felt that Deans were on the committee and were the best placed to understand the need for various positions across their own Faculties.

J. Hennessy's main concern was that the committee was not able to change the Faculty ranking once the order was established. This required that the units be strategic in their thinking and try to anticipate how the committee would rank the units. This was fine if the committee did indeed rank the units in the same order, but if this did not happen, not only would that department suffer, but all of the other departments ranked below it would also be affected. The process had the potential to pit departments against each other, at such time as positions became available.

A. Quema stated that this motion was in response to the various concerns voiced by J. Hennessy, but also as the result of a long process of consultation with the Deans and their respective Faculties. A. Quema noted that this was the response and feedback received from various members of the committee, in addition to many others.

L. Aylward noted how pleased she was to see this motion come forward.

P. Hobson felt that even if the TTTCAC process was flawed, it would be better to come up with a proposal for a new committee and process with the recognition that if that trumped the existing committee, Senate would be doing the right thing.

The Chair stated that this motion could be tabled and that Senate could go on to discussion of the second motion, which asked the APC to come up with an alternative process.

**Motion to table the motion. Moved by P. Hobson, seconded by K. Power.**

J. Hennessy wondered why Senate would table motion #1, since it could not be formally voted upon until the next meeting anyway. J. Hennessy assumed that the second motion would be discussed and perhaps voted upon later in the Senate meeting. Deciding in principle whether Senate wished to disband the current TTTCAC or keep it seemed like the appropriate first step.

The Chair reiterated that Senate would only be voting in principle on Motion #1, in the nature of a straw vote to decide whether or not a formal motion to disband the TTTCAC should proceed next month.

P. Hobson stated that as a point of order, this motion could not be brought to Senate without 30 days' notice of motion, and a straw vote would not be appropriate. P. Hobson repeated his request to table the motion.

A. Quema noted that the idea from the TTTCAC was that the two motions were inextricably connected. Senate was not formally voting on the first motion today; however, if Senate was waiting for a recommendation from the APC for a different process to emerge before they decided whether or not to get rid of the current committee, they could be waiting for months. A. Quema felt that from a procedural point of view, it was worth knowing now if Senate might wish to change the approach. If the committee remained in place for another lengthy period, it would have to continue its work using the current procedures, which some faculty were very unhappy with.

The Chair explained she had been in error; as a motion to lay on the table was not debatable. Senate should have moved to a vote immediately when the motion to table was made, not proceeded to discuss the issue. The vote was therefore whether Senate wanted to table motion #1; if the vote was in the affirmative, motion #1 would be set aside, while Senate went on to discussion of motion #2.

#### MOTION TO TABLE MOTION #1 DEFEATED.

A. Mitchell asked as a point of clarification whether item #1 had been just a notice of motion.

The Chair agreed that this was the case, but that both the mover and seconder of the motion wanted to get a sense of whether Senate agreed in principle that this was the appropriate next step. She had agreed that the issue could be discussed, to get a sense of the will of Senate.

M. Snyder noted that if the TTTCAC was not disbanded, there were certain steps during the summer that the committee would be required to take, regardless of any actions being taken simultaneously by the APC with regard to a new structure.

P. Hobson repeated that Senate was not able to vote on the motion to disband the TTTCAC without 30 days' notice of motion.

The Chair stated that no formal vote could be taken, but she believed a discussion in principle was in order. She noted that an appeal from the Chair could be made if a Senator disagreed with that ruling.

P. Hobson stated that the discussion was out of order and requested an appeal from the Chair.

The Chair summarized the rules surrounding an appeal, and explained that Senate would now take a vote as to whether or not the discussion was allowable. This would now be turned to a vote so that if the majority agreed that this was inappropriate discussion to be having, the discussion would stop. If on the other hand, Senators felt that this was an appropriate discussion to be having in principle to get what the will of Senate was, then the discussion

would continue.

A. Quema proposed a simple solution to the Chair.

A. Quema noted that there had been a proper seven days' notice of motion that the issue would be discussed at the current meeting, but that because of the change to the By Laws, the formal vote could not go ahead until the next meeting. A. Quema stressed that the intention was not to push the motion on Senate, it was merely to move the issue forward in a timely fashion. A. Quema asked whether it would be in order for her to withdraw the motion.

The Chair stated that it was in order to request a withdrawal of the motion, but a majority of Senators had to agree, as the motion was already under discussion.

The Chair asked D. Hobson whether he would be agreeable to A. Quema's proposal.

P. Hobson stated that he was agreeable.

The Chair now asked if all were in favour of allowing A. Quema to withdraw Motion #1.

APPROVED.

**Motion that the Academic Planning Committee be charged with recommending to Senate a new process that links the allocation of tenure track faculty to academic planning. In doing so, the TTTCAC urges the APC to preserve consultation with faculties and academic units as part of the new allocation process. Moved by A. Quema, seconded by J. Hennessy.**

J. Hennessy explained that in the planning discussion that is underway, the APC would be an appropriate body to develop a new process that would serve better than the previous one.

D. Benoit asked why another committee was needed to determine resource allocations and where they should be placed. D. Benoit asked why the VP Academic and the Deans couldn't do this, with input from the units.

The Chair noted that the APC would be coming forward with a proposed process for doing the job if the current motion passed; it might involve another committee, or some other structure.

A. Quema stated concerns that she had because P. Williams had originally suggested the creation of a committee like the TTTCAC to avoid decisions being made at the top, in terms of both hiring and allocation of positions. A. Quema saw this proposal as a regression, and stressed that it was important to have a process that didn't only take input, but which also invited consultation. A. Quema felt that if colleagues in the Faculty of Arts believed that they had no say in the process, this would lead to another round of dissatisfaction and distrust.

P. Doerr stated that as head of a department he had not experienced any problem with the existing process, recognizing that with the availability of

resources being almost non-existent, there were no grounds for fighting at present.

P. Hobson stated that the discussion did not pertain to the motion on the floor of Senate.

The Chair believed that the discussion was relevant to the motion.

K. Power drew attention to the fact that the TTTCAC begins its process in May and June of any given year, so that once the motion was deferred to the May meeting of Senate, and perhaps got returned to the APC one more time, it would be at least June before anything could actually be decided by Senate.

J. Hennessy responded that there were no negative consequences to such a delay at the moment, because no positions were being filled. J. Hennessy stated that the motion was not necessarily suggesting that a new committee be formed, or that the VP Academic become the default – the motion was for the APC to come forward with a process for Senate's approval.

L. Aylward felt comfortable with the academic leadership and was in favour of the motion.

J. Whidden suggested that the APC look to Paradise Lost and also take a look at Dr. John Connors' essay on how he first came to Acadia.

A. Vibert supported asking the APC to recommend a new process, but recognized that any process that involved selection of resources for some but not all units would inevitably involve some contention.

J. Stanley stated that he felt this to be a very healthy conversation and that he was pleased to be learning from it. This would set the framework for Acadia to operate in a more democratic and open manner. J. Stanley recognised the need to critically assess what Acadia does and how it is done. J. Stanley assured Senate that these sorts of conversations would also take place at the Board level.

B. Moody pointed out that an important addition to the motion was the wording '*...a new process that links the allocation of tenure track faculty to academic planning...*'. B. Moody noted that there was a strong sense on the part of many that that piece had been missing for quite some time, since the entire planning process had been dismantled at Acadia many years ago. This was an attempt to ask the APC to come up with a process that links the allocation of resources to academic planning once again.

M. Snyder felt that the TTTCAC had been less than effective because it had been set up with too rigid a structure. M. Snyder asked that the rigid structure be removed.

There being no further speakers, the Chair asked for all in favour of Motion #2.

MOTION #2 CARRIED.

The Chair asked who would report back to Senate on this issue. T. Herman responded that it would be him.

The Chair asked about a timeline for the APC and T. Herman to report back.

A. Quema stated that this was an urgent matter for the APC.

T. Herman stated that it would be more realistic to report back to the June meeting of Senate.

The Chair noted that although Senate was not required to have a June meeting, it was quite likely that one would be needed.

A. Mitchell asked whether the APC would provide preliminary details on what would replace the TTTCAC in time for the May Senate meeting, before the formal vote on motion #1 was held.

T. Herman was not yet certain what would come forward in May.

A. Quema noted that the APC bringing something to the May Senate meeting was not essential.

The Chair stated that the APC would report back to the June meeting of Senate.

L. Aylward asked for clarification about when motion #1 would be voted on.

The Chair agreed that there was some indication that Senators would prefer to hear back from the APC first. The movers could bring motion #1 forward again in May if desired, as the 30 days' notice of motion would be met. However, if some Senators preferred to postpone that vote until after hearing back from the APC, motion #1 could also be tabled in May if desired, allowing the vote on it to be postponed until June, depending on the will of Senate.

b) Languages and Literatures: response to APRC (*attached*)

The Chair provided some background. The APRC presented its review of the Department of Languages and Literatures to Senate in October. At the time, it requested that the unit respond to Senate on the recommendations by the APRC, within a six month period. The unit was encouraged to explore the sustainability of their Spanish and German major programs, and to explore innovative approaches to curriculum delivery.

R. Worvill spoke to the review.

R. Worvill reported that when the department was reviewed, the review team did note a number of things in the department that were in fact innovative responses to delivering a program with small numbers, but that they just weren't characterised in that way. The review did speak favourably of their Study Abroad programs and of the cross appointment in Spanish and German. In the Spanish and German units, they had been delivering majors with small numbers of faculty for quite some time.

R. Worvill also noted that language courses were provided for many students to meet Core requirements, while also allowing some to pursue a major that brought students to a sufficient level of competency.

R. Worvill noted that two IDST courses were on the books, in addition to the cross appointment, and the Study Abroad program; all of which were

considered by the Department to be innovative in nature.

7) Adjournment

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

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

---

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

## **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 (USP). The present document serves to amplify the content of the USP and is designed to serve as a guide for Academic Sector planning so that we can successfully achieve the Mission of the University. The USP 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" (modified slightly from that originally 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 approve this submission as guidance for academic planning at Acadia.

### **A. An Acadia education:**

1. Is rigorous and liberal and requires students to gain knowledge and understanding within and across 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. Emphasizes the importance of understanding all facets of the environment.
4. Promotes students' participation in research and creative endeavours in order to enhance their critical thinking and analytical reasoning, and to foster their understanding of the importance of these activities.

Attachment 5) b)  
Senate Agenda April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2013

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 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> 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)



Attachment 6) a)  
Senate Agenda April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2013

Two motions from the TTTCAC to be included in the Agenda of the April 8 meeting. A. QuemaA. Quema will move the motion and Jeff Hennessy will second it.

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

- 1) That the Tenure Track Teaching Complement Allocation Committee be disbanded.
- 2) That the Academic Planning Committee be charged with recommending to Senate a new process that links the allocation of tenure track faculty to academic planning. In doing so, the TTTCAC urges the APC to preserve consultation with faculties and academic units as part of the new allocation process.

Anne Quéma  
Chair of TTTCAC

**Department of Languages and Literatures**  
**Sustainability of the German and Spanish majors.**

In September 2012, the APRC brought forward to Senate a number of recommendations arising from the review of the department that took place in 2010. These recommendations included a request that the Department of Languages and Literatures ‘explore the sustainability of their Spanish and German major programs and [...] examine innovative approaches to curriculum delivery’. The present document is the department’s response to that request. In fact, these units have for some time now been addressing in effective and innovative ways the challenge of delivering a sound major program with small numbers of faculty; these approaches are described below.

**1. Some clarifications.**

a) Staffing:

The **Spanish unit** currently has two full –time faculty members, one half-time-time faculty member and a colleague who holds a full-time appointment at Acadia but who belongs half-time to the Spanish unit and half-time to the German unit (a cross-appointment). The **German unit** has two full-time faculty members, the colleague who works half-time in German and half-time in Spanish, and a PAD position which is occupied by a different person each year. The PAD is a German student in training to become a teacher of English in Germany, who works for one year at Acadia on a half-time, nine-and-a-half month CLT contract.

The Spanish unit has no position equivalent to the PAD position in German or the *lecteur/lectrice* positions in French. Essentially however, both the Spanish unit and the German unit have a similar level of staffing: two full-time colleagues and two half-time colleagues; this means that they can offer from 15 to 17 courses on campus in any given year (including the language courses that are offered to meet Core requirements in the Arts and Pure and Applied Science faculties).

b) Numbers of majors:

During the period 2008-09 to 2012-13, Spanish has served 10, 13, 10, 12, and 9 majors respectively, according to the statistics issued on the EDEN system. At the same time, there have been from 1 to 4 students studying at a Spanish speaking institution in Spain who are not included in the figures dispensed through EDEN because they are studying abroad, usually on exchange. It is a requirement of the Spanish major that students spend at least one term studying at a Spanish-speaking institution in Spain or Latin America; most of these students spend a whole year abroad. Nevertheless, the EDEN figures do not reflect this. This year, in addition to the 9 Spanish majors listed in the EDEN system, we have one Spanish major studying in Spain.

The same issue affects the statistics for German. The German major includes a compulsory year in Germany (the Freiburg program) and in any given year there can be up to about 9 students taking their 3000 level courses in Germany; however, these students are not included in the total number of German majors listed on EDEN. For the period 2008-09 to 2012-13, German served (including the Freiburg exchange students) 2, 10, 17, 21, and 21 majors, respectively. At the time the review of the department was conducted (March 2010), we had an unusually low number of German majors (2), a situation which we do not see as at all typical (14 majors 2006/7, 7 majors in 2007/8). It was most likely the result of the years of low enrolment generally at Acadia. Numbers have increased steadily since that date and there are currently 21 students enrolled as German majors studying on campus and in Freiburg.

These numbers compare very favorably with numbers of majors in other German and Spanish programs in the region. According to most recent CAUTG (Canadian Association of University Teachers of German) statistical survey the figures for the year (2011-12) show the following:

**(i) German**

*Dalhousie University:* four full-time faculty members, five part-time lecturers; 28 German majors

*Memorial University:* five full-time faculty members; one PAD, four part-time; 31 German majors

*St. Mary's University:* one full-time faculty member, one part-time; 5 German majors (the German major is not offered as a degree option any longer at Saint Mary's University)

*University of New Brunswick:* two full-time faculty-members, one PAD, one part-time; 2 German majors

*Acadia University:* two full-time faculty and two half-time: 21 German majors

According to the CAUTG survey results the German Studies Program at Acadia University has had the highest number of German majors per faculty nation-wide for the past two years.

**(ii) Spanish (this information was received from the Heads of these departments)**

*Memorial University:* two full-time faculty members; 12 Spanish majors

*Mount Allison University:* three full-time faculty members; 3 Spanish majors

*St Francis Xavier University:* two full-time faculty and one part-time; 10 Spanish majors (some of these are double majors)<sup>1</sup>

*St. Mary's University:* two full-time faculty members and two part-time; 5 Spanish majors

*University of PEI:* two full-time faculty and 4 courses taught by part-time colleagues; 4 majors

*Acadia university:* two full-time faculty and two half-time: 10 Spanish majors

---

<sup>1</sup> Beginning in the academic year 2013-14, St. F-X will be offering its B.Ed. students the opportunity to specialize in Spanish as a teachable subjects; strength in their Spanish program is quite possibly related to this new opportunity.

## 2. Innovative approaches to sustainability.

The Spanish and German units consider that they already have put in place some innovative approaches to maintaining a sound major program despite low staffing levels. On the matter of quality, we note that both majors require a minimum of 42 credit hours in Spanish or German, whereas at a number of other universities in our region which offer majors in these languages, a major can be obtained with fewer contact hours, generally 36, or two courses fewer than the number required at Acadia. At Acadia, the number of hours required for the Spanish major was raised from 36 to 42 a few years ago, in order to establish consistency between the major requirements for all three languages taught in the department.

### a) Study abroad programs

The compulsory term or year of study abroad has been a critical component in allowing the Spanish and German units to offer students the number of courses they need to achieve a level of linguistic competence and cultural knowledge that is sufficient for the BA degree. Many of our majors are students who begin taking Spanish or German only when they arrive at Acadia; they complete at least 18 credit hours (and up to 24) before they leave for the year abroad.

**Spanish** students then typically take one term at a language Institute (where they receive in excess of 150 instructional hours in Spanish courses) prior to enrolling in three to five courses at the university in second term. These students typically return with credits that are equivalent to a full course load at Acadia (30 hours).

**German** students are required to complete two semesters at the Albert-Ludwigs University in Freiburg, Germany. The CYF (Canadian Year in Freiburg) program offers at least 15 credit hours (or five courses). These courses are taught exclusively to CYF students and are specifically designed to meet Canadian academic requirements. Students are expected to take the remaining 15 credit hours at the Albert-Ludwigs-University, the Pädagogische Hochschule or the Sprachlehrinstitut to return with credits that are equivalent to a full course load at Acadia (30 hours).

In both cases, the year abroad allows students to acquire the number of credits that they need in order to meet the requirements of the Major; but it also does much more than this. The first-hand experience of living in a country where the language under study is the language of the majority encourages progress at a much faster rate than is possible in the Anglophone community of Wolfville and area, and also equips students with first-hand experience of the living culture of the target language. Many of our students find this a truly enriching and transformative experience, not only in terms of their linguistic progress, but also in relation to how they come to understand culture and differences between cultures.

### b) Double majors

The practice of academic advising gives colleagues from Spanish and German the opportunity to encourage capable students to add a language as a second major to another program of study. Adding a language major can enhance employment opportunities for our students in a number of different fields, including teaching and business. Spanish or German can be combined with any of the other Majors in Arts, but also with Business (for a BBA plus language) or with majors from the science faculty. A major in Spanish or German alone, may lead to limited career opportunities in Canada, except for the

most able, but combining a major in one of these languages with another major enhances career opportunities and choices as well as enriching personal development through greater cultural awareness.

c) Minors

We have students from all three faculties seeking to minor in German or Spanish; 18 or 24 hours of credit in a given language can give a student the type of competency in a language that means they can continue to develop their skills in that language after they leave Acadia by continuing to read or to engage in listening activities (CDs, radio, films) in the target language and travel to places where that language is spoken. A minor in a second language can usefully be combined with any major.

d) Major in one language and a double minor in two others.

Under the present calendar regulations, it is possible for students who already have strong skills in French or German or Spanish, to major in one language and minor in two others. This type of degree attracts students with a keen interest in mastering other languages, who envisage a career involving frequent travel or the need to interact with clients from different linguistic communities. A very small number of students choose this option, but it is not one that is available at all Canadian universities.

e) IDST courses.

The Department of Languages and Literatures has created two IDST courses (delivered in English) which students majoring in Spanish and German (and French) can take for credit towards the major and which other students can take as an arts elective. These courses are:

IDST 2463 Contemporary Perspectives on French, German and Spanish Literatures and Cultures

*A multi-disciplinary course to offer students a basic knowledge of literary and cultural periods/events of universal importance in these three target languages. The course will be offered in English. Students wishing to have this course count towards a major degree in the Department of Languages and Literatures will be required to write their assignments and essays in the language in which they major.*

IDST 3473 Introduction to contemporary French, German and Spanish Film

*A multi-disciplinary course covering developments in French, German and Spanish film as well as the theories shaping them, with a focus on literary adaptations. The course will be offered in English. Students wishing to count this course towards a major in a language will be required to write their assignments and essays in the language of that major.*

IDST 3473 will be offered in the 2013-14 academic session; the German unit is allocating one of its senior course slots to this course, which will be taught by the colleague holding the cross-appointment. Interdisciplinary courses aimed at majors in all three languages taught through the Department of L & L are an effective way to use the faculty resources that we have; one faculty member (aided perhaps by one or two colleagues providing invited lectures or classes during the course of the term) can deliver a course that contributes to three different majors. The downside of this approach is that the course has to be taught in English, whereas advanced level courses from each language major are typically conducted in the target language. Teaching in the target language means that students continue to develop their oral and written comprehension skills whilst studying literature and culture and is an important component in skill development. We think that a limited number of these shared courses given in

English can be valuable in terms of the effective use of resources but we do not envisage developing any more of them because of the limitations they impose on the use of the target language.

f) Cross-appointment

Following two retirements from the German unit, the department requested and was granted a tenure stream cross-appointment in German and Spanish. In 2010 a successful hiring was made and we now have a colleague who teaches in both units (alternating between giving three and two courses per year in each unit). This innovative position has allowed the Department to maintain the German major while adding course offerings in the Spanish unit.

3. What the four-year degree in Spanish or German offers.

Relatively few students have taken either German or Spanish courses before coming to Acadia. For this reason, the program in both units is structured as one which will allow a student to develop from the beginner level to functional competency in the four essential languages skills: listening, speaking, reading, writing.

In the **first year**, students are acquainted with the basic grammar rules of each language and acquire a vocabulary of fundamental expressions allowing them to cope with everyday activities. This formation includes developing the cultural awareness necessary to function effectively in regions where the target language is dominant.

The **second year** program builds on this foundation. Students take courses that reinforce their competency in grammar and structure whilst also taking courses that also develop their skills in oral expression as well reading skills and cultural awareness. With 21 or 24 credit hours behind them, students are in a position to make a success of the year abroad.

The **third year** is spent studying abroad where students can accumulate up to 30 credit hours in the target language; they can also take fewer hours in their language major and take courses in other disciplines if these have been pre-approved for credit by the relevant department at Acadia.

In their **fourth year**, students take from 6 to 12 credit hours in the target language (more if they wish) to maintain their existing skills and strengthen their reading whilst completing any other degree requirements they could not meet while away.

Students who arrive at Acadia with some experience of the language enter the program at the level commensurate with their skills (usually second year) and take all their courses at the higher levels. Skill level is determined by a placement test and/or an interview with a faculty member from the unit.

Because of the year abroad, capable students majoring in German and Spanish have the opportunity to develop very strong skills in all aspects of the language before graduating. The year abroad experience forces students to develop a degree of competency which they are unlikely to acquire without spending time in a place where the target language dominates. The courses we offer here represent a range of courses in literature and culture as well as in language to provide students with a well-balanced 42 credit hour specialization.

4. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.

In 2002, the Council of Europe passed a resolution adopting the CEFR for languages as a means of creating universally-recognized systems of validation of language competencies. The CEFR ‘provides a basis for the mutual recognition of language qualifications, thus facilitating educational and occupational mobility. It is increasingly used in the reform of national curricula and by international consortia for the comparison of language certificates.’ The framework was developed ‘through a process of scientific research and wide consultation, and provides a practical tool for setting clear standards to be attained at successive stages of learning and for evaluating outcomes in an internationally comparable manner.’ ([http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/cadre\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/cadre_en.asp))

In the absence of any comparable internationally valid standard in North America, the CEFR is increasingly being recognized and adopted as an appropriate tool for structuring language instruction in Canada and the USA. The German unit at Acadia will shortly become a centre which can offer CEFR testing (as the French unit currently is), and the Spanish unit is able to direct interested students to relevant centres if they wish to have their skills assessed according to this framework. The primary CEFR tests assess various language competencies, including oral comprehension, written comprehension, language structures (grammar), oral expression and written expression, according to a six-level scale: A1 (elementary); A2 (advanced elementary); B1 (intermediate) B2 (advanced intermediate); C1 (superior); C2 (advanced superior). At its meeting of 14 April 2011, the Department of L & L unanimously adopted the motion *that the Department explore the possibility of integrating and applying international accredited standards into the curriculum for language courses in the Department of Languages and Literatures*. Our goal would be to see language majors graduating with a level of B2 in all the skills, with some students achieving C1 in some of the skills. It will ultimately be very helpful for graduating Acadia students to know how they place in terms of the CEFR scales and it will increasingly be significant information for employers. By adopting a pro-active stance in relation to the CEFR for languages, the German and Spanish units (and this is also true for French) are ensuring that they keep pace with international developments in language learning and assessment.

##### 5. Conclusion.

The German and Spanish units offer a well-balanced and suitably demanding Major degree while providing non-specialists with the opportunity to minor in a language, meet core requirements or pursue a second language that interests them. When compared with other departments in Atlantic Canada, it is clear that our exchange programs have proven to be an effective way of maintaining the opportunity for students to major in one of these languages despite shrinking resources and declining numbers of faculty. Study abroad programs have long been recognized as an exceptionally enriching component of a liberal arts degree which not only give students the chance to develop their language skills but also transform their understanding of the world. Our new IDST course will bring together students from all three language units into a shared course; this will be a fruitful opportunity for them to exchange views and share knowledge about the culture of their Major. In addition, since it is open to students from all three faculties, this course will also give students from other specializations the chance to experience an advanced course from our unit without needing advanced skills in one of our three languages. The unit expects this to be a popular course and would certainly be interested in exploring the possibility of cross-listing it with another department. Finally, it is worth noting that the study of a second (or third or fourth) language has long been a central component of a solid liberal arts degree and that it is in

Acadia's interests to maintain such options at a time when young people are increasingly realizing that command of additional languages is a valuable skill in today's global job market.