Office of the Senate Secretariat

Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia
Canada B0P 1X0

Telephone: (902) 585-1617
Facsimile: (902) 585-1078

Minutes of the Senate meeting of Wednesday May 7th, 2014

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Wednesday 7th May, 2014 beginning at 9:00 a.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 35 present, plus three guests.

1) Approval of Agenda

The Chair stated that before the agenda could be approved, there were some revisions to be requested. This meeting was scheduled to continue to 11:00 a.m., but the Chair noted that if Senate was in the middle of something and wanted to continue, she might call for a motion to extend debate at that time. This would require a 2/3rds approval from Senators.

The Chair requested adding Curriculum Changes for Engineering to 'Time-sensitive Items', as item 4) c), and re-numbering other items to 4) d) and 4) e).

Under 'Priority Items' items, 5) b) Report from the Research committee, 5) c) Report from the Curriculum committee and 5) d) Report from the TIE committee would be added.

Under 'New Business', one additional Senate Annual Report would be added. Item 7) a) xii) would be the Faculty Development Annual Report.

There were no objections to these additions.

Motion to approve the agenda as revised. Moved by R. Perrins, seconded by D. MacKinnon.

AGENDA APPROVED AS REVISED.

2) Minutes of the Meeting of 14th April, 2014

Due to the minutes being circulated late, the Chair suggested that they be held over to the June meeting of Senate for approval.

3) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

The Chair noted regrets from M. Corbett, J. Yang, S. Hewitt, C. Lathem, L. Murphy, A. Vibert, P. Connelly, C. Stanley, and S. McCullough.

The Chair welcomed M. Scanlan once again from the Library (for the LibQual

presentation).

The Chair also welcomed G. Gibson, the incoming Biology Faculty Senator, A. Robbins and L. Davidson. The new student reps to Senate would be welcomed at the next meeting.

There were no objections to the guests attending.

b) From the President

President Ivany detailed the major announcement from the Federal Government concerning $1.5 billion of funding over a 10 year period for the Canada First Research Excellence Fund (CFREF). He noted that the U-15 group had put forward an idea for the Advantage Canada Research Excellence (ACRE) Fund. President Ivany acknowledged that this was a large amount of money, but raised the question how it would benefit the large research intensive universities – the U-15 group – and the smaller universities. He explained that allocations would not be done in a primary evaluative framework; they would be secondary and triggered by the existing granting councils. This would result in a disproportionate number of allocations going to the large research intensive universities. However, he felt there was recognition that if a formulae distribution from the granting council allocations was used, the CFREF allocation would be very small for a university such as Acadia. In a best case scenario, President Ivany hoped that Acadia might see something along the lines of the CRC program.

President Ivany noted that it would prove difficult to get a larger share of the pie. Allocation would not start until 2015-2016 and would peak in 2018-2019 at $200 million a year and continue at that level.

B. Anderson mentioned that at the University Faculty Council meeting the previous day, President Ivany had noted the opportunity he had to report to the Department of Labour and Advanced Education and Finance, and asked whether there were highlights from that meeting that he would like to share with Senate.

President Ivany reported that although it had been a good meeting, it was not Acadia specific, but part of a long line of meetings that were being held with the Province.

G. Whitehall asked President Ivany to detail the plans and vision he had for Academic Administrators and asked what would happen around future appointments. G. Whitehall noted that in the Faculty of Science an external competition was in progress to hire a Dean of Science, but in the Faculty of Arts there did not seem to be a similar commitment to coverage of the Library and the Dean of Arts.

President Ivany responded that decisions were often driven as a result of resignations or retirements, but noted that he was not in favour of 'Acting' positions and hoped that staffing of Senior Administrator positions would stabilize in the future. He noted that at the same time, it was better to take the time upfront and avoid making a costly hiring mistake. President Ivany felt

that senior leadership positions needed to be regularized. He pointed out that processes around the hiring and appointment of the Vice President Academic were well defined and he expected that a national search would take place during the coming year. President Ivany thanked R. Perrins for taking on the role for 2014-15. He expected that there would be an announcement soon regarding the Dean of Arts and University Librarian appointment.

c) From the Vice-President Academic

T. Herman reported that he and President Ivany met recently with their counterparts from the U-4 group. This was a planning meeting to talk about plans for the future and also look at what had already been achieved in past activities. It was important to maximize the ability to celebrate what it was that all four universities do well. T. Herman noted the difficulty of getting the niche that Acadia occupied more obvious across the country. In Canada, small liberal arts colleges were becoming a rare commodity, whereas in the United States they remained easily recognizable.

A new range of activities would be coming forward from the U4, including in particular more consultation; soliciting input, collaboration and involvement from the faculty and students of the U4 institutions.

d) Other Announcements

D. MacKinnon stated that a new process was now in place for the Canada Graduate Scholarships, whereby Acadia would be granted a quota of students. D. MacKinnon noted that there had been concerns with the process, and a concern that most of the applicants would be from Acadia. A number of Psychology students and two Biology students were recipients, but many of the others that applied were not eligible. Two students would be coming to Acadia from outside. However, one doctoral student, Cynthia Bruce in the School of Education, had been awarded a Canada Graduate Scholarship. This process was not a quota, and involved competing nationally.

D. MacKinnon also noted that President Ivany would be receiving a letter from the Department of Labour and Education around the Nova Scotia Provincial Graduate Scholarships. The number was not yet known, but this was the first time that the Provincial Government had directly funded graduate scholarships, rather than by including funding in the MOU. D. MacKinnon noted that the criteria for funding fell into Provincial areas of priority which would include commercialization potential. This could potentially be problematic for the Social Sciences and the Humanities areas.

4) Time-sensitive Items

a) Approval of the List of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2014 (*previously circulated*)

Approval of the List of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2014

D. Serafini noted that Cameron Mason was now eligible for the Certificate of Applied Science, and one deletion from the list: Chris Lundrigan (Kinesiology) would not be finished in time for Convocation.

Motion to move approval of the list of Graduates for the Convocation of May 2014. Moved by T. Herman, seconded by D. Benoit.

T. Herman noted that the Bachelor of Arts with Honours would be awarded to Matthew Kohlenberg under the new Aegrotat Standing. Matthew's father would be attending Convocation to receive the diploma.

D. MacKinnon informed Senate that the Governor General's Medal at the Graduate level would be awarded to Sonja Sapach, who was a graduate of the relatively new graduate program, Social and Political Thought.

MOTION TO APPROVE GRADUATES APPROVED.

The Chair reminded Senate that the enabling motion now needed to be read by T. Herman. This enabled a sub-committee to make any changes to the list of graduates, if necessary, before Convocation.

The Chair also noted that changes were made to the wording of the enabling motion last October at Senate, which would allow the sub-committee to make changes through to the following Convocation. This would allow students who absolutely needed their degree before the following Convocation, to receive it. In some cases a letter from the institution was not considered sufficient by employers or registration bodies.

D. Serafini apologized for not bringing an announcement to Senate in February, when one student had been given her degree under this new enabling motion; Sarah MacCathie (M.Sc. Psyc). Sarah needed the degree in order to be entered on the register as a Clinical Psychologist candidate.

The Chair noted that all Masters students from Psychology do need a conferred degree in order to be entered on the candidate register, which is a pre-condition for many jobs. A letter from the Registrar is not sufficient.

The Chair asked the Registrar for his thoughts on the possibility of offering another opportunity for students to graduate – a third Convocation.

D. Serafini responded that while supportive of the idea, he felt that the audit process needed first to be improved. Conversations with peers at other institutions showed that two Convocations remained the norm, and that even large schools such as Dalhousie only allowed three students to graduate at different times from the Spring and Fall Convocations. D. Serafini did point out that 16 month Education students did need to be looked at more closely. Meanwhile, the extended enabling motion would allow degrees to be conferred when needed.

T. Herman read the enabling motion:

"*Any candidate for an Acadia degree, diploma or certificate who should receive a grade or otherwise qualify or be disqualified between this Senate meeting and the Senate meeting in September 2014, may, if circumstances require, be considered by the Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee, the appropriate Dean, the appropriate Head/Director, and the Registrar, acting as an ad hoc committee of Senate, they having the power to make consequential amendments to the graduation list. Any such amendments to the list shall be reported to Senate at the next Senate meeting*".

Moved by T. Herman, seconded by R. Murphy.

ENABLING MOTION APPROVED.

b) Motion that Senate approve the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Theology (*attached*)

Motion that Senate approve the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Theology. Moved by H. Gardner, seconded by B. Brackney.

There were no objections to moving the curriculum items from the Faculty of Theology as one motion.

A. Robbins described the course changes to the orientation courses, and noted that these will now introduce new students to the tools that they need to engage the disciple. On the non-ordination track, Bachelor of Theology program, the three Praxis courses would allow students to test their skills in practical ways and develop skills in reflective practice.

MOTION APPROVED.

c) Motion that Senate approve the curriculum changes for the School of Engineering (*attached*)

Motion that Senate approve the curriculum changes for the School of Engineering. Moved by A. Mitchell, seconded by P. Williams.

There were no objections to moving the curriculum changes from the School of Engineering as one motion.

A. Mitchell explained the joint engineering program with Dalhousie and noted that several years ago, Dalhousie made changes to the Engineering program curriculum, which had not been viewed positively during the recent Accreditation process. The Accreditators refused to grant credit for some material that was viewed as complementary studies. As a result, Dalhousie was rapidly pushing through curriculum changes to meet the Accreditation requirements, prior to receiving the final report. These changes would increase the apparent complementary studies material in the curriculum. Actually, it is the same amount of material covered, it is just explicitly acknowledged within one credit course, rather than spread across several courses.

A. Mitchell discussed the changes to the curriculum, noting that the content of the 'Introduction to Engineering' course would be altered.

President Ivany asked whether there was agreement amongst the other universities to make the curriculum change simultaneously.

A. Mitchell responded that some discussion had occurred and that all universities agreed that these changes could be carried out.

A. Quema asked that Senate acknowledge the fact that the Curriculum Committee had worked extremely hard to enable this change to come through

to Senate in a very short time frame.

Senators voiced their appreciation, as did the Chair.

S. Major asked whether fewer non-engineering students would now be able to take Introduction to Engineering.

A. Mitchell responded that there would be no change in that respect and that non-engineering students were still welcome to take the course, though the revised material may potentially be of less interest to them.

MOTION APPROVED.

d) Report from the Senate Nominating Committee(*attached*)

A. Mitchell spoke to the report from the Nominating Committee and noted the difficulty that the Chair had experienced in getting nominations for positions.

A. Mitchell noted that Susan Boddie was not a Senator and therefore was not able to sit on the Senate Executive.

The Chair noted that Senators were needed to fill various positions and encouraged Senators to step forward.

D. Benoit asked for the definition of an elected Senator and whether this meant one of the Senators from the three Faculties.

The Chair agreed that this was a grey area, especially because Directors of Schools, in practice, sat on Senate in an ex-officio manner, whereas the criteria suggested 'elected faculty members'.

The Chair gave the first call for nominations.

H. Wyile offered to sit on Senate Executive.

The Chair made the second call for nominations.

R. Murphy offered to sit on Senate Executive.

The Chair made the third call for nominations.

Deputy Chair of Senate remained unfilled.

C. Rushton asked about the procedure for seeking nominations for a Lay Person on Senate.

The Chair believed that it could be anyone who was not connected with Acadia directly, and could not be a full-time employee of Acadia.

A. Mitchell agreed that a wide call went out, but also requested further ideas from Senators.

THE CHAIR DECLARED THAT THOSE PEOPLE IN THE REPORT, AND WHO PUT THEIR NAMES FORWARD FROM THE FLOOR, WERE ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION AND THANKED THEM FOR AGREEING TO SERVE.

e) LibQual Presentation

B. Brackney provided an introduction to the LibQual survey and presentation, noting that it was initiated in 2000 as an experimental process to benchmark quality, which has since turned into a standard assessment tool and has been applied across more than 1000 libraries. B. Brackney then introduced Melissa Scanlan, a former staff member from the Vaughan Memorial Library.

Melissa noted that 601 patrons responded and detailed the way in which the questions and answers provided useful feedback on a number of issues. One of the requests from respondents had been for the Library to join Novanet, which has now been done. Physical upgrades have also been carried out in the Library, with additional outlets being provided for the students and an additional wireless router.

B. Brackney summarized four continuing concerns :

- The need to further improve the facilities
- Restoration of staff positions
- Increase in funding for Collection development
- Enhanced access for Library hours

A. Smith noted that students tend to collaborate in the Library and require more modern workspaces.

B. Brackney expressed appreciation to R. Perrins for his general support.

A. Quema asked how the Library asks for more funding and what the process of allocating money for the Library was?

T. Herman responded that the budget for the Library fell under the Academic Sector, and as a result it was a matter of discussion when considering the other units in the Academic Sector. T. Herman noted that sources of funding come from the operating budget or from external gifts and donations. These allow the University to enhance the collections and T. Herman noted that the VP Advancement was working hard to obtain donations and funding for the Library.

T. Herman noted that the Academic Sector had fared well in the budgeting process, compared to some units across campus.

G. Bissix stated that he had completed the survey and found it to be too long and very repetitive.

M. Scanlan agreed that there had been a number of comments to that effect and wondered whether it would be possible to provide feedback to the survey organizers.

President Ivany asked whether Acadia had access to results from other institutes so that some comparisons could be determined.

M. Scanlan agreed that results of other institutions were available and that Acadia was comparable.

5) Priority Items

a) Report from the By-laws committee (*attached*)

The Chair noted that a written report had been circulated and that B. Anderson was now Chair of the By-laws committee.

B. Anderson provided a report on behalf of the By-laws committee and thanked the Chair of Senate for her support as the By-laws committee embarked on a review of Senate Standing committees, to recommend a more efficient and effective committee structure, while keeping in mind the terms of reference. B. Anderson noted that the work of Senate needed to be enhanced as a result of recommendations from the By-laws committee. The committee was meeting that afternoon to begin a mapping process and expected to develop recommendations for a new committee structure that would be brought to Senate by October/November 2014. B. Anderson requested feedback from Senators which would make the report from the By-laws committee a more inclusive set of recommendations. B. Anderson asked whether the Chairs of other Senate standing committees would like to be involved.

T. Herman felt that directly involving the Chairs of other Senate standing committees would be a good approach to get input.

There were no other responses, so it was left that B. Anderson will invite Chairs of other Senate committees to participate.

b) Report from the Research Committee

D. MacKinnon reported that the Research Committee remained consumed by the Strategic Research Plan, and had now got a draft of theme areas and strategic focus. D. MacKinnon stated that the committee will meet this summer with representatives from the various Faculty groups and report to Senate in the Fall with something that had been vetted by groups across campus.

c) Report from the Curriculum Committee (*attached*)

A. Quema directed Senators to the written report on page 30 of the agenda but gave a short verbal report. The Senate Curriculum committee met eight times during 2013-2014, with three meetings falling during Oct/Nov 2013. At those meetings, the committee discussed general principles of education and how they might be used to improve curriculum processes. The following questions had been discussed:

- As an institution that prides itself on providing a liberal education, do we provide enough pathways for students to pursue courses outside of their departments or faculties?

- Are the pathways easy to navigate? Are the basic requirements (i.e. total credits) for a degree (or elements of a degree – major, minor, etc.) consistent across departments?
- Should they be consistent (e.g. of what value is a minor when it means something different in different departments)?
- Are the program requirements clear to students, to potential students, and to anyone who works with students?
- How well does a degree here map to a similar one at a peer institution?
- Do we have a sense of how students experience the curriculum or what they expect from it – are there things we think we do well that may, in reality, be very difficult for students to achieve?
- Do students and advisors know about all possible options (i.e., are any unknowns attributable to how our curriculum is designed and organized)?

A. Quema noted that the Curriculum committee had discussed these issues at length but her belief was that these discussions now needed to be taken beyond the confines of the Curriculum committee, by talking to students, Schools and departments, Faculty Councils, as well as one on one discussion. This could generate some interesting results and lead to a reconfiguration of the curriculum.

D. Serafini recognized the magnitude of this project and recognized the limitations of what the Curriculum could do alone. Derek drew attention to the forward planning process item scheduled for later in the Senate meeting.

A. Quema noted that she would be on sabbatical during 2014-2015 and pointed out that the work of the Curriculum committee, and particularly the Chair, had grown considerably. A lot of consultation and organization was required, and there was currently a need to do more. There was a need to think about the structure of the Curriculum committee and a way needed to be found to assist the Chair and to help to propel these initiatives forward.

The Chair noted that the work of the Curriculum committee fell into two categories: regular work that needed to be done all the time and also a large planning process. It was hard to do both at the same time.

Senators were asked to take the above questions back to their respective units and to encourage discussion.

S. Major felt that the work of the Curriculum committee interfaced with the work of the Academic Planning committee.

A. Quema agreed and also pointed out the overlap with the T.I.E. committee.

The Chair noted that many of these issues were identified at the start of the year and recognized that this could prove to be a multi-year project; however, it was important to start asking questions.

D. Seamone drew Senate's attention to the fact that A. Quema had gone above

and beyond the call of duty in her Chairing the Curriculum committee and asked that Senate acknowledge her contribution to the Curriculum committee leadership.

Senate warmly acknowledged A. Quema's contributions.

D. Seamone also requested that the Chair of Senate circulate the list of questions to all Senators to ensure that they were not lost.

T. Herman echoed previous comments and noted that the work that the Curriculum committee had done was tremendous. He also pointed out the importance of interactions between committees, an example being the interaction last year between the APC and the TIE. T. Herman liked this model and felt that it would work well for the APC and the Curriculum committee.

d) Report from the T.I.E. Committee

D. Serafini stated that the report, which had been circulated previously, was comprehensive and thorough. Adjustments to timetabling and curriculum were complex projects that went well beyond just timetabling. D. Serafini planned in September to present a list of high level priorities and would also be deciding how to engage all of the stakeholders (Town Hall meetings etc.), before finally deciding on specific language to effect change.

6) Brought forward from April 14th, 2014

a) Motion regarding Affirmation of Senate Membership (*attached*)

The Chair asked S. Henderson to take the Chair as she would be presenting the next two motions.

Motion regarding Affirmation of Senate Membership. Moved by D. Holmberg, seconded by A. Quema.

D. Holmberg requested two minor changes before making the motion. The title '*VP Enrolment and Student Services*' needed to be changed to '*VP Recruitment and Student Services*', to reflect the new position title. Secondly, the sentence '*Senate affirms that its appropriate current membership, as of 2013, is as follows*' to be changed to read '*Senate affirms that its appropriate current membership, as of 2014, is as follows*'.

D. Holmberg reminded Senate that there were discrepancies with the various lists of Senate membership, with additional discrepancies between the Senate and the Board lists. Motions were approved at Senate over a year ago, but the Board had since asked Senate to affirm their current membership. At that point, the Board will do the same, so that both bodies were on the same page. This will likely not occur until October 2014.

MOTION APPROVED.

b) Motions regarding Constitutional Changes

Motion that Senate approve the housekeeping changes to the Constitution and by-laws, highlighted in blue in the attached document

(*attached*) **and also the procedural changes, highlighted in green. Moved by D. Holmberg, seconded by H. Wyile.**

D. Holmberg requested two minor changes before making the motion. On page four, item 6c., the wording '*it shall be the responsibility of the Chair to approve the Agenda for Senate meetings*' should be changed to read '*it shall be the responsibility of the Chair, working with the Recording Secretary, to prepare the Agenda for Senate meetings*'. The second wording change was on page five, 7b. under the Recording Secretary duties. '*to prepare and distribute agendas for Senate meetings*' should be changed to read '*to format and distribute agendas for Senate meetings*'.

D. Holmberg noted that yellow highlighted changes in the document were changes that had already been approved. Changes in blue were mostly minor housekeeping changes, mostly centred around the description of the duties of the Chair, Recording Secretary, and Secretary (Registrar). The changes reflected how duties actually had been distributed in recent years.

Changes in green were procedural changes to the Constitution and By-laws, mostly centred around techniques to encourage optimal committee functioning. These changes had been discussed at Senate and agreed to in principle earlier in the year. D. Holmberg drew attention to the requirement for Senate committees to have a transitional Chair who would be responsible for calling the first meeting in the fall. This issue had not been discussed earlier in the year, but was offered as a potential solution to the problem of committees not meeting to elect a Chair, because no Chair had yet been elected to call the first meeting. D. Holmberg will contact committee Chairs about this change if the motion is passed.

A. Quema noted that on page four there were changes around the role of the Registrar and asked whether the Registrar should remain named as Secretary to Senate and asked whether the Registrar wanted to continue as Secretary of Senate.

The Chair pointed out that over the years the duties of the Registrar had migrated to the Chair of Senate or to the Recording Secretary of Senate.

D. Serafini noted that the wording of the document accurately reflected what had been happening during the last year, and noted that taking on additional Senate responsibilities without additional assistance would prove to be a challenge.

A. Quema pointed out inconsistencies with the By-laws with regard to the voting powers of the Registrar. On the Senate Curriculum committee the Registrar did not have voting rights, whereas the Registrar could vote on other committees of Senate. The Curriculum committee was one area where the Registrar should be able to vote.

The Chair noted that the Registrar also had no vote on Senate, which proved awkward at times. Any change to the Registrar's voting status would have to go through both Senate and the Board of Governors, because it would be a change in the membership of Senate.

It was not known why the Registrar did not have a vote on Senate or the Curriculum committee in the past. A. Quema felt that perhaps in the past faculty felt that they owned the curriculum and didn't want anyone to reform it, but she did not feel this to be the case now and recognized that the Registrar brought valuable expertise to the issue.

MOTION APPROVED.

D. Holmberg resumed the Chair.

c) Report from the Faculty Development committee regarding existing services to support Faculty Development (*attached*)

The Chair reminded Senators that S. Major attended a regional meeting and noted that Acadia had fewer resources available to support teaching and teaching development than other institutions. The Faculty Development committee were asked to investigate the resources available at other institutions and to report back to Senate.

S. Henderson reported that Acadia lagged behind in a number of areas, both in teaching support and in the area of faculty teaching awards. Most other institutions offered some support in terms of dedicated staff or a director to help facilitate dossier preparation for teaching awards. Another meeting was planned for the summer and the committee was now looking for guidance from Senate on particular areas that it should concentrate on.

J. Banks asked whether other universities required professional development workshops.

S. Henderson had not seen anything that was required while researching the issue, but some universities offered optional certificates as accreditation to those who completed particular training.

D. Benoit stated that he attended an AAU meeting, representing Acadia as the Faculty Development representative. One of the members was the University of the West Indies and D. Benoit noted that all new hires there have to go through a faculty development process in terms of pedagogy and have to receive a certificate as a condition of their employment. Other institutions felt that this was a good idea.

D. Benoit felt that the other reps on the AAU were taking steps with their VP Academic to get faculty names put forward for 3M awards, to help in the way in which their schools were recognised.

S. Major preferred not to have a model of imposed faculty professional development and felt that this needed to be a faculty driven approach. S. Major did feel that the Mt. Allison model was an excellent one and noted that at Mt. Allison, the faculty are not only supported but are also extremely supportive of the process.

G. Whitehall recognised the important work that Research & Graduate Studies carried out each summer; running the grant writing workshop. G. Whitehall noted that a fresh set of eyes by someone with expertise in the language of funding applications was always helpful when submitting research proposals. Excellence in teaching led to strong research and vice versa.

B. Anderson voiced her support for allocation of additional resources to support faculty development, and well as getting support for teaching international students.

T. Herman agreed with S. Major that a collaborative faculty involvement was a very successful model, and noted that he was very aware of the need for additional awards and recognition. T. Herman noted that individual Faculties were developing processes to feed into this process of recognising and supporting strong teaching, but that finite resources remained a challenge. T. Herman was in discussion with the VP Advancement to pursue external funding opportunities, from Alumni in particular.

A. Mitchell asked whether the Faculty Development committee had been able to get feedback from institutions as to how faculty got feedback about their teaching effectiveness. This could help to improve teaching in a non-judgemental way.

S. Henderson responded that mentoring was provided at UNB, but that it was difficult to get that sort of information from the websites.

C. Rushton pointed out that the NSCC appeared to have an excellent model, and that they provided information and resources on effective teaching to all new employees.

S. Major noted that at the same time as Acadia's Learning Commons had been eliminated, Dalhousie had shown tremendous growth in their Institute for Teaching and Learning. A huge infrastructure existed there, complete with a Director.

A. Quema noted that Acadia was known for its strong undergraduate teaching and felt that teaching quality had suffered at the big universities. There was a need to gain recognition for what Acadia faculty were doing.

President Ivany thanked the committee for the research it had carried out and noted that the current situation was a source of frustration to everyone. He asked whether the committee could create a developmental plan and meet with R. Perrins in the near future. It was recognized that while it would be difficult to move straight to the PEI model, the current state of affairs was not good enough. President Ivany noted that despite having some of the best faculty at Acadia, it was short-changing them because of the lack of support for faculty awards.

D. Benoit reminded Senators that UPEI ran a five day Summer Teaching Institute every summer, which would be held in the Cavendish area this year.

The Chair drew Senators' attention to funding available to faculty through the Professional Development Fund (Article 25.10) that could support attending such workshops.

T. Herman noted that there were many ways to help build faculty members' pedagogical skills, one of which was by taking advantage of the human

resources that Acadia had in its own high-quality teachers. A pilot project was tried several years ago with some of the best faculty offering support to newer, less experienced faculty.

It now being 11:00 a.m., the Chair asked whether Senators would like to adjourn. A. Quema asked if there was a possibility to continue. The Chair agreed that a motion to extend debate could be proposed; if 2/3 were in favour, the meeting could be continued.

Motion that the meeting continue to 12:00 noon. Moved by A. Quema, seconded by P. Williams.

MOTION TO EXTEND DEBATE APPROVED.

d) Motion that Senate approve the prioritized recommendations from the APRC for the Department of Philosophy (*circulated previously*)

Motion that Senate approve the prioritized recommendations from the APRC for the Department of Philosophy. Moved by T. Herman, seconded by R. Perrins.

T. Herman commended the Philosophy Department and noted that the review was a very positive one in all areas. Recognition was given to the challenges that a small unit faces in a University.

T. Herman pointed out that priorities 1, 2 and 3 were the most important. These included staffing challenges and the need for increased complement. The challenge with the current part-time hiring process was noted and it was recommended that the University look instead at multi-year hiring to deal with both fluctuations and continuity.

T. Herman noted that it was also recommended that prospects of cross-listing be made use of when identifying courses in other departments that could count towards a Philosophy degree, and vice versa. This would increase the amount of choice and flexibility for students.

T. Herman ran briefly through the remaining recommendations and directed Senators to the detail provided in the attached report.

MOTION APPROVED.

T. Herman thanked Senate for its support in the important process for the departments and units, and noted that it was important that Senate approve these reviews, rather than just receive them.

e) Report from the Academic Planning Committee (*attached*)

T. Herman noted that the report from the Academic Planning Committee had been on the agenda since January. The APC was working on a policy paper to study the program approval process, which would be brought to Senate in the future.

A. Quema asked about the allocation of permanent faculty positions and asked whether the APRC reports and reviews would be part of the process once the allocation was being discussed.

T. Herman agreed, but also noted that some reports could become outdated as the university was on a five to seven year cycle for those program reviews.

A. Quema pointed out that there was a level of cynicism around the process of external reviews. While they were an important process, once recommendations were made, departments were frequently unable to carry through with the recommendations, due to budgetary restrictions.

T. Herman noted that there was a monitoring process in place for just that reason. The conversation was taking place at all universities to address this challenge. The reviews were substantive and rigorous.

The Chair asked whether Senate would prefer to leave item 6)f) *Motion regarding Forward Planning Process*' to the June meeting of Senate.

There were no objections.

7) New Business

a) Senate Committee Annual Reports

The Chair noted that a formal motion to receive the reports was not required.

i) Archives Committee

R. Perrins noted that one meeting took place during the year and archival storage space issues were discussed.

ii) Curriculum Report

A. Quema now spoke to the second half of the Curriculum report and discussed the process of consultation that the Chair engaged in with School Directors, Department Chairs and also Interdisciplinary Program Coordinators to address any perceived problems, and to provide clarification where necessary. A. Quema noted the importance of having a print version of the Calendar that be consistent and clear for students.

D. Serafini stated that there were several inconsistencies and that he would be re-arranging the Calendar to list by program instead of by Department or School.

A. Quema reminded Senators that the Curriculum Committee did not approve curriculum changes, but that they simply recommended to Senate any curriculum changes for Senate's approval. Senate were asked to remember that it was their prerogative to question curriculum changes before approving.

iii) Report of the Research Ethics Board

D. MacKinnon reported that all meetings were conducted very thoroughly and that the Board was actively engaged in discussion, noting that the two community members contributed greatly to the committee discussions.

iv) Timetable, Instruction and Examination

D. Serafini highlighted the summary of changes that had been recommended and approved by Senate: the Fall reading week and the extension of the

committee report

registration and drop deadlines. D. Serafini also discussed the fact that the committee by-laws did not accurately reflect the work that the committee was being asked to do. Changes to the membership list were also needed, as there was no longer a Dean of Students. The report also detailed concerns about the timing and distribution of exams. D. Serafini noted that the students serving on the TIE committee had been very vocal. The committee will wait for the recommendations from the By-laws committee before proceeding further.

v) Research Committee

D. MacKinnon covered the second part of the Research committee report, noting that G. Whitehall had mentioned the grant support workshops. D. MacKinnon stated that this year the workshops would focus on Partnership grants that spread across all granting councils and that the workshops would be held over a two day period (9th/10th June). D. MacKinnon pointed out that Federal granting was tough to obtain, and that although there had been considerable success some years, other years had not served Acadia well. There would be a structured mentoring process in place this year. R&GS was also searching for external support that could be provided for grant applicants – individuals that could come in and assist with grant writing.
D. MacKinnon also stated that a pre-assessment could be carried out for faculty who planned to make applications, to provide advice as to whether it would be worth their while to do so. D. MacKinnon noted that R&GS had detailed knowledge of how NSERC rated an application in three separate categories, all three of which needed a 'strong' ranking to result in success. D. MacKinnon felt that this could save time and work for both faculty members and R&GS and allow them to steer faculty towards more suitable and obtainable grants.

D. Benoit pointed out that Article 25.55 funding was tied to faculty that had applied externally and that perhaps the criteria should be reconsidered in future.

D. MacKinnon noted that his comments referred specifically to NSERC/SSHRC and that there were other places where faculty could apply for funding. He felt that 25.55 served as seed money to support faculty members so that they could then apply externally. This had now been extended to a three year period. Some faculty members needed no more than 25.55 money for their research plans.

G. Whitehall came from a small liberal arts college in the USA where a list of the applications that a faculty member had made to NSERC/SSHRC would be built into their career evaluation. This encouraged faculty to continue with applications. This could also count in the tenure process and needed to be started early in a career.

G. Whitehall noted that the University of Alberta required faculty members applying for tenure to have obtained an external research grant.

President Ivany agreed that faculty needed to be encouraged to apply for grants and asked D. MacKinnon to follow up on this. President Ivany felt that if Acadia's top scholars stopped applying, there would be reverse feedback that

was being advocated on a policy level. Many good applications to SSHRC were not funded due to lack of money, not because they were not good applications. President Ivany felt it important that faculty from small institutions continued to make sure that their voices were heard.

D. Seamone echoed an interest in getting credits for time and effort spent on grant applications.

D. MacKinnon responded that he and R. Perrins would work on this item together. He also noted that R&GS would never deny anyone the opportunity to apply for a grant, but that it was important to be realistic. In the area of SSHRC, D. MacKinnon noted that J. Guiney Yallop and one other applicant had received a 4A rating more than once. There had been some efforts to support those who received a 4A rating, but that was through money that was left over from SSHRC grants. If there were no SSHRC grants received at the institution, this source of funding would also dry up. .

It being almost 12:00, the Chair suggested the remaining items be covered at the June meeting of Senate. She asked that the June meeting of Senate be a three hour meeting.

P. Williams provided a verbal Notice of Motion for the next meeting that a Library representative plus one other elected representative would be added to the membership of the Academic Planning committee.

The Chair responded that only a seven day Notice of Motion would be required. [NOTE: The Chair was incorrect in this statement; this change does actually require 30 days' Notice of Motion. However, the verbal Notice of Motion is sufficient to meet the 30-day requirement. It can be followed up with specific written notice closer to the June meeting.]

The Chair stated that in the case of 7) a) x) Academic Integrity Committee and 7) a) xi) Academic Discipline Appeals Committee; no reports were tabled because neither committee had met during 2013-2014.

Motion to adjourn at 12:05 p.m.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

_____

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

For presentation at the Acadia University Senate on May 7, 2014

Motion from Dr. Harry Gardner, Dean of Theology
That the curriculum changes for the Faculty of Theology be approved as circulated.
These changes were approved by the Acadia Divinity College Senate at its April 23, 2014, meeting.

1. **Rationale:**
   This course is added for undergraduate and graduate students to introduce them to the nature of theological study and research, and acquaint them with related tools and resources.

   IDST 3013 Orientation
   IDST 5013 Orientation

   This non-credit, Pass/Fail course is part of the annual orientation to Acadia Divinity College (ADC) and is normally required for all entering students at ADC (not including students in program partnerships). It will orient students to ADC and to seminary-level research and writing. Through lectures, demonstrations, practice exercises, readings, testing, and an all-day retreat, students will be introduced to various expectations, skills, and resources necessary for advancing successfully through their degrees, and they will also begin their preliminary personal testing. A part of this course will be an all-day session which provides an overview of the Bible's narration of events from Abraham to the early church.

2. **Rationale:**
   These courses are added to the non-ordination track Bachelor of Theology program to allow for the progressive development of practical skills and reflective practice for students at the undergraduate level.

   DISP 2023 Introductory Praxis

   This course will introduce students to reflective practice (praxis). Students will be expected to commit to volunteer positions in church or community settings in consultation with the instructor. Students will be encouraged to become 'reflective practitioners' by contemplating their volunteer experiences in reflection papers and in structured debriefing sessions with the instructor.

   DISP 3023 Junior Praxis

   In this course students will develop reflective practice (praxis) by volunteering consistently in a specific church or community ministry setting, chosen in consultation with the instructor. Students will develop abilities as 'reflective practitioners' through reflection papers and structured debriefing sessions with the instructor.

   DISP 4023 Senior Praxis

   In this course students will develop critical reflective practice (praxis) by volunteering consistently in a specific church or community ministry setting, chosen in consultation with the instructor. Students

will be expected to integrate knowledge and skills as 'reflective practitioners' through regular journaling and structured debriefing sessions with the instructor.

Senate Nominating Committee 2014 Annual Report to Senate

April 29, 2014

Membership
R. Seale (Arts)
G. Whitehall (Arts Senator)
A. Parsons (Science)
A. Mitchell (Science Senator)
D. Piper (Prof. Studies)
I. Hutchinson (Prof. Studies Senator)
Chair: A. Parsons

Duties

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

Activity

The Senate Nominating Committee performed its duties mainly via email, and several Senate committee positions required replacements throughout the past year. Nominations to be presented at the May meeting of Senate are listed below, though several positions remain unfilled at this time (TBA). A Chair of this committee for the 2014-15 academic year has yet to be decided upon.

Nominations for Vacant Positions
Chair of Senate (1 year)
Paul Doerr
Deputy Chair of Senate (1 year)
TBA
Faculty Elections Officer (1 year)
TBA
Representatives on the Senate Executive: 2014-2015 (1 year)

- S. Boddie (Arts)
- replacing E. Callaghan (Professional Studies) **TBA**
- A. Mitchell (Pure and Applied Science)

Representative on the University Senate: 2014-2017 (3 years)

- replacing William Slights (lay person) **TBA**

Replacements on the By-Laws Committee:

- J. MacLeod (Senator ~ Prof. Studies): 2014-2017 (3 years)

Library Committee

- W. Brackney (Senator - Chair): 2014-2017 (3 years)

Ashley Parsons, Chair
Senate Nominating Committee

Senate By-Laws Committee
Bi- monthly Report to Senate, April 14 1014

Background

The Senate By-Laws Committee has embarked on this review of the Committee structure at the request of Senate. The Senate By-Laws Committee was asked to recommend options for a more effective and efficient Senate Committee structure, keeping at the foundation of our work, the Senate Terms of Reference. http://senate.acadiau.ca/Terms_of_Reference.html We are responding to a sense that streamlining the Committee process, while ensuring that the work of Senate is achieved, is an important outcome.

Progress

Since we last reported to Senate, we have met with the Senate Executive to share our emerging ideas, including:

- Our intention is not to eliminate Senate responsibilities, and as possible strive for a way to complete the work more effectively.
- Make this an improved Committee process and overcome the inertia, which comes from some Committees not having an active role over a period of time.
- Consider an oversight mechanism to monitor the achievements of Senate Committees.

We engaged the Senate Executive in a preliminary discussion about the structure and composition (similar to what was shared during our last Senate update, with some additional details), including the identification of Standing Committees, 'Just-in-time' Committees to complete specific pieces of timely work, and a monitoring process. We wanted to reinforce that not all Senate work needs to be completed by Standing Committees; results can be achieved by working on important issues aligned with the Senate terms of Reference, as they emerge.

We received very useful and thoughtful reminders and comments from the members of Senate Executive, including, that decisions need to be anchored in governance, and that academic accountability is nested in Senate. We were encouraged to identify whether there are gaps that exist, which would mean we are currently not meeting all aspects of the mandate of Senate. A way to do this is to complete a mapping process, to look at what we need to do as a Senate and map this against the Committee work being done. Edith Callaghan indicated an interest in talking with the By-Laws Committee about how we could move on this idea. Senate Executive encouraged us to develop a timeline for the restructuring mandate and reinforced that this included a clear set of recommendations with a justification. As well, it was agreed that a monitoring process was important.

At this point, our principal objective is to determine the best way of achieving the work of Senate and so it is valuable for all of us "not to let preoccupation with the structure that does exist, distract us from the bigger picture of what needs to be done and how it might be done effectively and efficiently." *Jim MacLeod, Senate By-Laws Committee*

Next Steps

What we would appreciate advice on is how quickly we want to move on this work. It is not viable to complete a set of recommendations related to restructuring, which can be implemented, by September 2014. We are confident we can have a clear direction by this date, and report on milestones to Senate along the way.

B. Anderson, Chair (Representative, Faculty of Pure and Applied Science)
William Brackney (Representative, Faculty of Theology)
Jim MacLeod (Representative, Faculty of Professional Studies)
Herb Wylie (Representative, Faculty of Arts)

Motion Regarding Affirmation of Senate Membership

Background: There were discrepancies amongst various membership lists of Senate. These discrepancies were resolved to Senate's satisfaction last year (see Senate minutes of November 2012). When the Board of Governors was asked to approve these motions, they found their own records also did not fully match Senate's records. Eventually, the Governance Committee of the Board of Governors asked Senate to simply affirm its full current understanding of its own membership; the Board of Governors will then affirm that membership as well, and that list will be used by both bodies as the approved membership from that point forward. As per the Constitution, this motion requires 30 days' Notice of Motion in Senate and a 2/3 majority vote, followed by 30 days' Notice of Motion at the Board of Governors and a 2/3 majority vote.

Motion:

Senate affirms that its appropriate current membership, as of 2013, is as follows:

Chair (see Note below)
Deputy-Chair (from the Elected Faculty Members of Senate)
Chancellor
President
Vice-President, Academic
Vice-President, Enrolment and Student Services (non-voting)
Vice-President, Finance and Administration and Chief Financial Officer (non-voting)
Dean of Arts
Dean of Professional Studies
Dean of Pure and Applied Science
Dean of Theology
Dean of Research and Graduate Studies
Director of Open Acadia
University Librarian
Professional Librarian from among members of the University Community holding appointments as professional librarians.
Registrar, Secretary to Senate (non-voting)
Student Union President
Twenty-seven members of Faculty, to include nine from each of the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science. This membership shall include one representative from each school.
A member of the Faculty of Theology
Three members of the Board of Governors
Six students, at least one of whom shall be a Graduate Student (see Note below)
Three lay persons, nominated by the Senate Nominating Committee who are not eligible for membership under the roles and categories laid out above provided they are not full-time employees of Acadia at the time they are appointed lay members.

Note: The position of Chair is open to ex officio members of Senate, Senators, and Faculty members who are not Senators. Should an ex officio member of Senate be elected as Chairperson, there shall be no adjustment to the composition of Senate; should a Faculty member of Senate be elected as Chairperson , a replacement member shall be elected from the Faculty to which the Chair belongs; should a member from the Faculty at large be elected, there shall be no adjustment to the composition of Senate.

Note: Four student members of Senate shall be appointed by the Acadia Students' Representative Council. The term of service shall be the same as that of the SRC which appointed them. One student member of Senate shall be appointed by the Graduate Students Association and shall serve a one-year term commencing in September of each year. One student member of Senate shall normally be appointed by the Acadia Divinity College Student Association, and shall serve a one-year term commencing in September of each year. In the event the Acadia Divinity College Student Association is not able to select a representative in a timely fashion in a given year, the appointment shall be made by the Dean of Theology. Unless otherwise specified, student members of Senate Committees shall be appointed by the Acadia Students' Representative Council.

Motions Regarding Changes to the Constitution and By-laws

Background: The circulated document contains changes to Senate's Constitution and By-laws. The changes highlighted in yellow have already been approved at previous Senate meetings, and are included here merely for Senators' information. Note that the changes to Senate membership still require formal ratification by the Board of Governors. Changes highlighted in blue are fairly minor "housekeeping" changes, designed to bring the constitution and by-laws in line with how things are actually done, in practice (e.g., acknowledge electronic circulation of documents; note allocation of duties between Secretary, Recording Secretary, and Chair, as actually practiced). Changes highlighted in green are new additions, agreed to in principle by Senate at its December 2013 meeting. Note there has been one new addition, not discussed at the December 2013 meeting: the addition of a "Transition Chair" for each committee, to attempt to address the problem of committees not meeting because no Chair has been assigned to call a meeting.

Motions: That Senate approve the "housekeeping" changes to the Constitution and By-laws, highlighted in blue in the attached document.

That Senate approve the changes to the procedures of Senate Committees, highlighted in green in the attached document.

Report of the Faculty Development Committee, 28 February 2014

The Faculty Development Committee met on 5 February 2014. All three members at the meeting are new to the FDC, which has not met for at least two years. Lisa Price was elected Chair, and the committee considered the last report of the FDC, presented to the 9 October 2012 meeting of Senate. That report called for a re-working of the FDC's mandate to emphasize the teaching component of faculty development, lamented the loss of the Learning Commons, and suggested a series of workshops on effective and innovative pedagogical practices.
The committee then turned to the motion passed at the 9 December 2013 meeting of Senate:

Senate directs the Faculty Development Committee to report to Senate, by the March meeting, on teaching awards and other practices for teaching support and development on campus, and also to explore models for teaching support and development at other AAU institutions.

The committee then came up with a list of teaching supports, programs and awards that are offered by other AAU institutions (and Bishop's) for the purposes of comparison to Acadia. The universities were divided among committee members who then investigated whether the institutions have centres or offices for the support of teaching and what their web presence is; whether there is dedicated staff in those centres; whether regular programming, workshops or conferences are offered; whether development is acknowledged through certificates or diplomas; whether teaching excellence is celebrated and what nature of teaching awards are offered.

Observations from the survey

It appears that almost all universities in the region have centres for the support of teaching and/or professional development. Most of these centres have dedicated staff – including administrative assistants, directors, and/or faculty with course releases. Most of the centres run regular workshops, seminars or conferences on pedagogical methods, technology, preparation of teaching dossiers; some offer courses leading to a Diploma in University Teaching. Most universities also regularly confer teaching awards within faculties and across the university and celebrate those who have demonstrated excellence in teaching at convocations, on webpages or in university publications. Some institutions offer prizes to teaching award winners in the form of extra professional development funds.
In comparison to other AAU institutions, Acadia provides very limited teaching support and awards. The Fountain Learning Commons still exists in name, however, there has been no programming or employed staff/director since 2010. Approximately 10 years ago, Acadia offered some grant support to faculty to develop scholarship in teaching and learning, the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Awards program. Teaching engagement fellowships were also granted in the form of course release to faculty who wanted to develop innovative approaches to teaching. These programs have not existed for the past five years. Presently, a number of awards exist at Acadia which recognize excellence in teaching. The Acadia Students Union offers two awards. The Teaching Recognition Award is awarded to newer faculty members who have demonstrated strong in-class teaching and support of student development. The Community Leadership in Teaching Award recognizes professors who are excellent teachers and have a strong presence in the community. The Alumni Association also awards the Alumni Award for Excellence in Teaching recognizes professors who have a "continued record of excellence in teaching," although this particular award has not been granted for the past four years. The Faculty of Professional Studies awards on an annual basis an Outstanding Teaching Award.

In 2004, the Dean's Committee prepared a proposal for Faculty Awards. The proposal examined models for faculty development offered at other AAU institutions. It outlines a detailed Faculty Awards Nomination Program.

Conclusions

The FDC will continue to investigate ways of promoting faculty development and celebrating excellence in teaching, and will do so under the assumption that no new resources will be forthcoming. The FDC will consult the March 2004 proposal for Faculty Awards. At the very least, Acadia must develop resources to assist its faculty with applications for regional and national awards for teaching excellence. To succeed, faculty development at Acadia will require widespread participation/engagement.

Lisa Price, Chair
Jonathon Fowles
Stephen Henderson

Descriptives					
University	**Reviewed by**	**Notes**	**Office or Centre Name**	**Staff supported?**	**Web Presence**
Acadia	Jonathon	Mission statement values excellence in teaching, invests in outstanding faculty ; The University community will support, recognize, and reward faculty through enhanced faculty professional development, an increased availability of teaching resources, and new programmes through which good teaching is identified and rewarded.	Learning Commons "Acadia will create a Centre for Curriculum, Learning, and Teaching, led by faculty, to coordinate faculty support and support pedagogical excellence across the disciplines. To support excellence in teaching, the University will continue to provide advanced technological resources and sponsor periodic symposia and conferences on effective pedagogy."	No, not since 2010	Limited - some from strategic plan 2006
Bishops	Jonathon	Mission statement values excellence in teaching			Could not find anything through web
CBU	Jonathon		CBU Centre for Teaching and Learning	Coordinator, faculty liaison, Manager tech & online learning, technical writer web support, manager online learning.	Yes
Dalhousie	Lisa		Centre for Learning and Teaching	21 directly employed or associated with Centre somehow	Yes
MSVU	Steve		Teaching and Learning Centre	No, not since 2012	Yes, but not prominently featured
Mt. Allison	Steve		Purdy Crawford Teaching Centre	Yes - on leave Winter 2014	Yes, but not prominently featured

MUN	Jonathon	DELTS is perhaps best known as a distance education provider. But we're so much more. We service all on-campus technical support, media production and course delivery, and offer faculty and graduate student training opportunities and course support	DELTS - Distance Education, Learning and Teaching Support Centre creation of the Instructional Development Office created in 1997. (now DELTS)	Yes - several	Extensive through DELTs and the Presidents teaching awards
PEI	Jonathon	Webster centre philosophy - faculty receive the help they need in a timely practical manner, support faculty to become better teachers	Webster Centre for Teaching and Learning - Faculty development office for Faculty	Yes - director and staff.	Online brochure - mostly for student support
SMU	Lisa		Centre for Academic and Instructional Development	Four staff members including a director	Yes
St.Thomas	Steve		Learning and Teaching Development Committee	Yes - Faculty coordinator with 2 course releases	Yes - direct link from homepage
STFX	Lisa		No Centre	No	Yes
UNB	Steve		Centre for Enhanced Teaching and Learning	Yes; director, project manager and at least one admin assistant	Yes, but not prominently featured

	Support & Development			
University	**Resource development**	**Workshops and/or conferences**	**Development grants**	**Certificates/credits**
Acadia		not specific to teaching; e.g. wellness etc.	through PD	no
Bishops				
CBU	teaching dossier, journals and blogs, course design and delivery; EXTENSIVE online materials and guidance	yes - online tips, in person workshops	not seen	not seen
Dalhousie	Professional dev., new teaching dev., TA development	regular workshops and annual conference	Teaching grants for course design and development, and assessment of student learning, travel and student engagement	certificates
MSVU	No	Not recently; hosted AAU Teaching Showcase 2011	No	No
Mt. Allison	No	Yes; teaching portfolio workshop; Fall Teaching Day; hosted AAU Teaching Showcase 2013	No	No
MUN	teaching portfolios, classroom etechnology, course development, awards preparations	Through development workshops and seminars, programs for the teaching development of faculty and graduate students; From face-to-face seminars and online sessions to one-on-one consultations and meetings, Allyson Hajek, instructional design specialist with DELTS, helps Memorial's faculty and instructors enhance their teaching and related skills.	Yes.	
PEI	teaching dossier	Lets talk teaching day, brown bag lunch series, teaching dossier workshop, teaching partners program for new faculty	apply for PD funding for workshops courses, seminars	

SMU	A number of resources including academic technologies, resource webpage, new faculty orientation and network, and individual consultations	Not obvious from webpage	Project, travel and development grants (called awards on website)	
St.Thomas	Yes; guidance for using social media and developing alternative teaching methods	Yes; lunchbag lectures, Friday afternoon workshops	No	Yes; courses leading to a Diploma in University Teaching offered in coordination with UNB; $300 cost is covered by STU upon completion
STFX	Faculty mentoring program, teaching resources webpage	Brown bag lunch series around teaching	Travel grants and scholarly teaching grants	
UNB	Yes; have worked with faculty to develop multimedia teaching tools & supports	Yes; workshops seem to be offered as well as "Kaleidoscope" annual December conference on teaching	No	Yes; courses leading to a Diploma in University Teaching offered in coordination with STU; $316 for UNB full-time & part-time faculty and grad students

	Awards			
University	**Type**	**Levels**	**Reward ($ or other)**	**Celebration / recognition**
Acadia	FPS	Student - ASU, department, Alumni	FPS $1000	FPS at FPS meeting
Bishops				
CBU	Alumni Teaching Awards; Instructional Leadership awards; Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher education Alan blizzard award	Alumni and Instrictional awards can be forwarded for AAU awards	not identified	Recognituion of AAU awards; and other awards on website listing
Dalhousie	President's award, Alumni award, Part-time instructor award, and leadership award	4 University-wide teaching grants	All have certificates and one has permanent plaque and gift	Presented at meeting like Senate, covered in Dal news
MSVU	External (support for preparing award applications)			No
Mt. Allison	Internal - Faculty (Crake) and university-wide (Tucker)		Crake - $2000; Tucker - $5000; both go to PD fund	Yes
MUN	Presidents Award for Distinguished Teaching, Presidents Awards for outstanding Teaching	Distinguished = only faculty with 10 years teaching experience; Faculty & Lecturers and instructional staff 2 separate categories for outstanding teaching award.	Distinguished & Outstanding teaching awards = $5000 toward teaching activities & PD, award in Univ calendar, personalized scroll,	Recognition at President's Award Ceremony, Name on plaque in public space in University building.
PEI				
SMU	Educational Leadership Award, University Teaching Scholar	University award	Monetary reward for leadership award, plaque	Announcement at convocation and noted on webpage
St.Thomas	Full-time and part-time awards, and "instructional leadership" award	University-wide	$1500 for full-time award; $250 for part-time award paid to PD funds	Yes; awards presented at Spring Convocation

STFX	Outstanding Teaching Award	University award	Certificate	Award presented at convocation, webpage devoted to university, regional and national award winners
UNB	Four university-wide awards; at least seven faculty specific awards	Mostly full-time; possibly one part-time award	unknown	Yes; publication of a newsletter with profiles of award winners

Academic Program Review Committee –
Recommendations arising from the Review of the Department of Philosophy

December 19, 2013

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) received the formal response from the Department of Philosophy to the External Review Team's report on April 26, 2013. We subsequently met on November 26, 2013 with the Department Head, Dr. Marc Ramsay, to discuss the Department's response to the review. After careful consideration of the review, the response to it from the Department, and our discussion with the Department Head, the APRC offers a set of recommendations below. The reviewers' recommendations are included in italics, with the original recommendation number and section (Teaching/Research/Service = T/R/S) in the External Academic Program Review document in brackets ***[ ]***.

A copy of the review and the Department's response will be made available to Senate. The APRC's recommendations are presented below **in bold**, organized by level of priority, from highest (1) to lowest (3). Within each level of priority the order of recommendations is arbitrary:

Priority 1

[T1, R1, S2] We very strongly recommend that some way be found of providing a new and continuing full-time faculty position for the Department of Philosophy, perhaps conjointly with another department or program, and that ways of maximizing the usefulness of this appointment in relation to (other) non-strengths of the Philosophy Department mentioned above and below, and indeed across the Faculty of Arts, be identified and implemented.

1. **The APRC recommends that the Department of Philosophy work towards collaboration with other units and programs on a range of activities to help meet the needs of the department. We respect the Department's challenge with the current part-time hiring process and encourage the University to develop a process to better facilitate multi-year appointments that allow for some continuity and flexibility at the program-staffing level.**

[T6] We recommend that the following efforts be made in respect of cross-listing: (1) Identify all the courses offered by other departments at Acadia that might properly be allowed to count toward a Philosophy major; (2) identify all the Philosophy courses that might properly be counted toward the major of another department; (3) explore prospects of cross-listing, in a sense that would allow course descriptions under the same number to appear in the curricula of both participating departments (e.g., POLS/PHIL 4343 Political Philosophy I); and (4), wherever appropriate and feasible, cross-list.

2. **The APRC strongly endorses this recommendation. We feel that identifying courses offered in other departments that may count towards a Philosophy degree helps to increase student choice and flexibility as well as to increase the flexibility within the department to diversify its course offerings and support its research activity. We also feel that working with other units to identify Philosophy courses that may count towards other majors helps to increase flexibility as well as to diversify the pool of students available to take Philosophy courses.**

[T7] We recommend that through cross-listing, or in any other feasible way, the Department teach special topics courses more regularly.

3. **The APRC feels there is a direct connection between cross-listing courses and the amount of flexibility created within the Department as well as for students. We strongly endorse the recommendation to explore the cross-listing of courses in other areas with Philosophy.**

Priority 2

[T3] We recommend that the REB, SPT, and ESST commitments in respect of .17 teaching allotments be in some way institutionally entrenched as multi-year commitments, which are activated without yearly applications from the Department.

4. **The APRC acknowledges the planning challenges that result from the current process and encourages the University to work towards a multi-year budget-planning process that allows for some certainty for units. We recommend a 3-year cycle that allows for a multi-year commitment of resources where appropriate, but also affords an opportunity for review and assessment at the end of the commitment.**

[T8]) We recommend that the Department consider ways in which its courses might address the interests and needs of the growing number of international students and students outside of the Faculty of Arts.

5. **The APRC acknowledges the efforts already made to promote Philosophy offerings to students outside of the department and faculty. We encourage the discussion to continue at the Department level and support the efforts currently underway to promote its offering of logic courses to international students.**

(R2) We recommend that the University consider and seek to implement ways of changing the guidelines for McCain funding so as to permit .17 relief for any professor with an academic book contract who needs extra time to ready his or her book manuscript for publication.

6. **While McCain funding may not be the most appropriate mechanism to achieve this end, the APRC encourages the Department to work with the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies to explore and identify options for external funding for temporary teaching relief when carrying an acute scholarly burden.**

(R3) We recommend that the Department and the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies actively explore ways of improving their dialogue about research productivity and, in particular, about success in external grant applications and on taking advantage of internal funding opportunities.

7. **The APRC endorses this recommendation. As well, we recommend that the Department engage the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies in dialogue about how research within the Department might be reflected in any strategic research plan.**

[Students] We strongly recommend that the University seek to provide further opportunities for Philosophy students to obtain scholarships, bursaries, research assistantships, and related kinds of support.

8. **The APRC recommends that the Department work with the Office of Advancement to identify opportunities for external funds for student support (scholarships, bursaries, research assistantships), including targeting Philosophy Alumni.**

Priority 3

[T2] We recommend that two or more 3000-level Philosophy courses required or usable for the major be converted to 4000-level courses.

9. **The APRC recognizes the work already completed to convert Phil 3853 to a 4000-level course and encourages their efforts to examine a limited number of additional courses that may be candidates for conversion.**

[T4] We recommend that public relations material and events be prepared which take pains to advertise to students the links between their non-philosophical studies (e.g., in the sciences) and the various 'philosophy of' courses taught by the Department (e.g., Philosophy of Science), as well as the benefits of combining the two.

10. **APRC acknowledges the efforts already made to promote Philosophy offerings to students outside of the department, as well as the relatively strong enrolments that have resulted. There may be additional opportunities for further promotion; to that end, the APRC encourages the Department to proceed with its plans to more widely advertise it logic courses to non-Philosophy majors.**

[T5] We recommend that a working space for students admitted to the new MA in Social and Political Thought be found in BAC, near the participating departments.

11. **The APRC acknowledges the importance of student space. We also recognize the limitations the institution faces (*i.e.* there is no unused space in the BAC). We also respect the desire of departments to retain dedicated meeting spaces. The APRC encourages the Dean of Arts to engage faculty members in the relevant programs to work together to identify possible solutions for a space that is in closer proximity to faculty members teaching in the SPT program.**

(R4) We recommend that all faculty teaching in the Philosophy unit, possibly in concert with other philosophers from the region or local academics from relevant non-philosophical disciplines, form a discussion group with the explicit aim of generating and criticizing more paper or chapter drafts in preparation for eventual publication.

12. **The APRC recommends that the Department work with the VPA to facilitate a structure for this activity. We suggest the U4 League might provide one avenue to explore possibilities.**

(R5) We recommend that members of the Department seek to participate more regularly in national and regional philosophy conferences.

13. **The APRC acknowledges the need of faculty members within the Department of Philosophy to participate in conferences most appropriate to their research. At the same time, we encourage faculty members to look for opportunities to participate in national and regional philosophy conferences as appropriate.**

(S1) We recommend that members of the Department deliberately consider how to scale back modestly on service work while keeping the Department running efficiently.

14. **The APRC recommends that the Department monitor their service commitments, but also recognizes and appreciates the important role that the Department's service plays both within the institution and within broader communities, as well acknowledges the profile that their service helps create for the Department.**

Academic Planning Committee Report to Senate, January 2014

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

The APC membership is as follows:
1 Vice President Academic T. Herman (ex-officio)
1 Dean of Arts R. Perrins (ex-officio)
1 Dean of Prof. Studies H. Hemming (ex-officio); G. Bissix (Acting, 1 Jan–30 Jun 2014)
1 Dean of P&A Sc. P. Williams (ex-officio)
1 Faculty Member J. Hooper 3 yr (ret. 2016)
1 Faculty Member T. Weatherbee 2 yr (ret. 2014)
1 Faculty Member D. Duke 3 yr (ret. 2015)
1 Student D. Shea 1 yr (ret. 2014)
The Chair of the Committee is the Vice President Academic.
(*Source: Acadia University, Committees of Senate – 2013-14, p. 8.*)

Since its last report to Senate (18 June 2013), the APC has met on six occasions (26 June 2013, 4 July 2013 (jointly with TIE), 8 August 2013 (jointly with TIE), 12 Nov 2013, 10 Dec 2013, 17 Dec 2013). For the information of Senators, please consult the 18 Jun 2013 report submitted to Senate for the activities of the APC prior to that date.

Timetabling
In response to concerns expressed by students, faculty and staff regarding our existing timetable and its present use, the APC examined data on course conflicts, classroom utilization, enrolment by time slot and slot use. It met twice jointly with the TIE (Timetable, Instruction Hours, and Examination) Committee in July and August to explore these data as well as review the existing Senate Guidelines Governing Timetabling. From those meetings a joint unanimous motion to Senate emerged proposing an addendum to the existing Guidelines which explicitly describes principles and features to guide timetable planning. The motion was subsequently passed in the September 2013 meeting of Senate.

Further exploration of timetable reform is presently underway in the TIE Committee. Discussions with the TIE Committee and the Registrar revealed that the existing TIE by-laws may require revision to allow more flexibility in setting and recommending policy, including the need to clarify the oversight responsibilities of the TIE vs. those of the Registrar.

Program Approval Process
The APC examined and discussed the present approval process for new academic programs or significant modifications to existing programs, and determined that the present process lacks a mechanism to ensure that changes align with institutional priorities and that resource requirements are systematically reviewed. To that end, in consultation with the Registrar, the APC has drafted a proposed process that clearly outlines the responsibilities of those involved; it provides the APC, with clear communication to Senate, oversight responsibilities, without interfering with the robust curriculum

development and approval process that already exists. Creation of the proposed process will come forward as a motion to Senate shortly.

Supporting Interdisciplinary Studies at Acadia

In its recent review of Women's and Gender Studies, the Academic Program Review Committee recommended that the Academic Planning Committee examine governance challenges facing inter/transdisciplinary programs. To that end, in December we met with a group of IDST Program Coordinators, who offered a series of joint recommendations on governance and hiring procedures for IDST programs. Recommendations included clearer definition of the status of IDST programs, their coordinators, and their representation on decision-making bodies; adequate support mechanisms for IDST hiring; and support for IDST faculty after hiring.

A free-wheeling and productive discussion followed, including an exploration of the complex and dynamic relationship between units, disciplines and programs. There was also discussion of the efficacy of creating a Senate Committee on IDST; the Academic Planning Committee is presently considering bringing forward a motion to that end. The APC will also ensure that inter/transdisciplinary programs and dependencies are considered as a separate factor in its considerations going forward.

Structural Change Capacity

Discussions with the IDST Coordinators underscored the importance of developing mechanisms to match resources and structure. Shifts in enrolment patterns and changes in staffing levels due to attrition have created a situation where there is greater disparity between resource levels across campus. Indeed, the Academic Planning Committee is concerned that in order to fully address the challenges arising from our return to institutional carrying capacity, volatility in program demand, and severely constrained resources, we need to entertain campus-wide conversations around structural change and its potential role in achieving strategic planning goals and a sustainable configuration.

Allocation of Permanent Faculty Positions

In October, the Vice-President Academic informed the Deans and the Acting University Librarian that a modest hiring environment is anticipated in the upcoming year. As a result, it is expected that individual programs, following the guidelines approved by Senate on 18 June 2013, will be preparing requests for submission to the APC. To that end, the APC is developing an assessment tool for evaluating requests based on several dimensions of sustainability; it will circulate a synopsis of that tool shortly.

The APC has received several informal suggestions from individuals as well as a formal request from one academic unit that the University defer further permanent faculty hiring until it develops and implements a strategic change framework that allows us to align organizational processes and structure to make most effective use of scarce resources. The APC appreciates this sentiment, acknowledges the structure-resource challenges we face and will ensure that any permanent hiring at this juncture will be cautious and deliberative.

APC Forward Planning Process

The APC is presently developing a forward planning proposal that outlines a strategic framework for insuring sustainable academic integrity. It intends to bring that framework to the February meeting of Senate for discussion.

Respectfully submitted,
Tom Herman, Chair

SENATE ARCHIVES COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 2013-14

April 25, 2014

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:

Committee Chair and Arts representative: Paul Doerr (2015)
Arts representative: Jennifer MacDonald (2016)
Arts representative: Lance LaRocque (2014)
Professional Studies representative: Brenda Trofanenko (2015)
Science representative and committee scribe: Catherine Morley (2016)
Theology representative: Robert Wilson (2014)
Alumni appointee: Bev Richardson (2016)
Presidential appointee: Ann Smith (2015)
Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches appointee: Vacant
Student representative: Stephanie Bethune (2014)
Archivist: Pat Townsend (ex-officio)
Archivist: Wendy Robicheau (ex-officio)
University Librarian: Robert Perrins

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

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

ACTIVITIES THIS YEAR: The committee met only once this year (albeit with great gusto) on March 6 to discuss issues of concern to Acadia's Archives. We received and reviewed activity reports from the Archivists and toured the university Archives. The Archives continue to be heavily used by university and community researchers alike. Donations to the Archives also continue at an impressive pace. The committee took note of future Archives requirements for more storage space and an expanded database.

Submitted by Paul Doerr.

SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT
APRIL 25, 2014

Membership
Brett Ells (student representative); Leo Elshof (FPS); Sonia Hewitt (FA); Jeff Hooper (FPAS); Chris Killacky (ADC); Anne Quéma (FA); Robert Raeside (FPAS); Roxanne Seaman (FPS); Derek Serafini (Registrar); Darcy Shea (student representative); Pat Townsend (Library).

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

Process
Over the course of the academic year, the SCC met on 8 occasions:

October 28, 2013
November 4, 2013
December 4, 2013
December 12, 2013
December 16, 2013
January 14, 2014
January 30, 2014
February 27, 2014

The early meetings in October and November were devoted to the discussion of general principles of education and how they might be used to improve curriculum processes. Questions that the SCC members discussed include:

- As an institution that prides itself on providing a liberal education, do we provide enough pathways for students to pursue courses outside of their departments or faculties?
- Are the pathways easy to navigate? Are the basic requirements (i.e. total credits) for a degree (or elements of a degree – major, minor, etc.) consistent across departments?
- Should they be consistent (e.g. of what value is a minor when it means something different in different departments)?
- Are the program requirements clear to students, to potential students, and to anyone who works with students?
- How well does a degree here map to a similar one at a peer institution?

- Do we have a sense of how students experience the curriculum or what they expect from it – are there things we think we do well that may, in reality, be very difficult for students to achieve?
- Do students and advisors know about all possible options (i.e., are any unknowns attributable to how our curriculum is designed and organized)?

The 5 meetings in December and January were devoted to the analysis of curriculum proposals from the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science. For the benefit of new and returning members of the Committee, the first meeting began with a review of the mandate of the Committee as stipulated by Senate's Constitution. On the basis of the Committee members' analyses and comments, the Chair consulted with school directors, departmental chairs, and interdisciplinary program coordinators to address various problems such as the need to clarify the terms of program and course descriptions. In all cases, the objectives were to ensure that students have access to clear and accurate information, and that programs maintain descriptive coherence. Once clarifications and revisions were reported to the Committee by the Chair, the Committee recommended the revised proposals for Senate's approval. Then, the Registrar and the Chair collated and proofread all the submissions in a document to be submitted to Senate. Senate approved the proposals for curriculum changes on February 10, 2014.

The February meeting was mostly devoted to a discussion led by Derek Serafini on attempts to re-organize the Programs of Study portion of the Calendar. Generic material will be placed at the front of Programs of Study, and all discipline-related material will be alphabetized in a subsequent section. This presentation led to a discussion on the meaning of majors, options, specializations, streams.

Anne Quéma
Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee

To: Acadia University Senate
From: S. Maitzen, Chair, Research Ethics Board
Date: 23 April 2014
Re: **Annual Report of the Research Ethics Board**

For the period 1 May 2013 to 30 April 2014:

REB members
Dr. Joan Boutilier, Community Member
Dr. Alice Cohen, Faculty Representative, Arts (15 October to 31 December 2013)
Dr. David F. Duke, Faculty Representative, Arts (to 15 August 2013; from 1 January 2014)
Mr. Adam Foster, Graduate Student Representative*
Ms. Anita Hudak, Community Member
Dr. David MacKinnon, Dean, Research and Graduate Studies (*ex officio*)*
Dr. Stephen Maitzen, Chair
Dr. Susan M. Potter, Faculty Representative, Pure and Applied Science
Dr. Anna Robbins, Faculty Representative, Theology
Dr. Christopher Shields, Faculty Representative, Professional Studies

* Non-voting

Applications and meetings: During the reporting period, the REB reviewed 71 new formal applications for ethics approval, as well as numerous formal requests from researchers to approve changes to previously approved research. The REB met on 11 occasions during this period.

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

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

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

Appeals: None

Complaints: None

Guidance sought from the Canadian Secretariat on Research Ethics: None

Matters out of the ordinary: None

Other comments: None

Senate Research Committee
Annual Report to Senate
May 2014

Committee members:

Abramson, Z. (Arts)
Brackney, W. (Theology)
Brudish, J. (graduate student)
Colton, J. (Professional Studies)
Lathem, Callie (undergraduate student)
MacKinnon, D. (Dean, RGS; Chair)
Redden, A. (Research centre Director)
Robicheau, W. (Library)
Silver, D. (Pure & Applied Science)
Trofanenko, B. (Canada Research Chair)

The Senate Research Committee met on seven occasions: October 8, November 5, December 16, January 16, February 12, February 28, and March 21. The work of the Committee this year has focused exclusively on the development of Acadia's Strategic Research Plan (SRP). The committee will meet again in May and as necessary through the summer to facilitate the focus groups and campus dialogue regarding the SRP.

Strategic Research Plan

The development of Acadia's SRP has been a (painful and unfortunately slow) work in progress. The plan for review and renewal as originally devised by the Senate Research Committee and approved by Senate in 2013 was as follows:

> (a) meetings by the Dean of Research & Graduate Studies with all department heads, school directors, and program coordinators to discuss research cultures; (b) unit and program engagement with structured questions focusing on research strengths, research connections, strength building, and perceived utility of the current SRP; (c) focus group discussions of preliminary analyses of unit and program submissions; (d) the development of a preliminary draft for campus distribution and an open forum discussion; and (e) a final draft submission to Senate in the fall of 2013.

The process was substantially delayed by (b), with only four units responding: Economics, History & Classics, Nutrition & Dietetics, and Psychology. Consequently, Senate approved a modified plan in which the Dean of RGS was asked to (1) once again request that the departments and schools engage with the structured questions, and (2) undertake an analysis of all grants and contracts, including those funded through the University Research Fund, which were processed through RGS over the last five years, with a view to identifying theme areas.

In response to (1), two additional departments responded: Biology and Earth & Environmental Science. The analysis undertaken in (2) yielded 206 code categories of research activity. The work of the Senate Research Committee since January has been to reduce these code categories to themes. Working in small groups, the Committee has developed four tentative theme areas with a single overarching strategic focus. At this point, Committee subgroups are identifying cross-campus examples of theme activities. Draft writing regarding the themes and strategic focus has begun, with the Dean of RGS as the

lead writer. This is not a writing exercise to prepare a draft SRP, but rather to ready the analyses such that the Committee can then reengage the original process, starting with (c), i.e., focus group meetings with originally identified groups over the summer, followed by an open forum discussion, likely in September, 2014.

Mentoring Workshops

Research and Graduate Studies and the Senate Research Committee will once again be offering Tri-Council grant writing workshops, tentatively planned for May and June. In addition, a special Tri-Council partnerships and collaborations grants workshop is planned for June 9th and 10th, sponsored jointly by Acadia University, Mount Saint Vincent University, St. Mary's University, St. Francis Xavier University, and Cape Breton University. Acadia facilitators will include Leigh Huestis, Director of the Office of Industry & Community Engagement (a section of Research & Graduate Studies), and Michael Leiter, Professor of Psychology and Tier 1 Canada Research Chair in Occupational Health and Well-being.

Respectfully submitted,

David MacKinnon
Chair, Senate Research Committee

Senate Committee on Graduate Studies
Annual Report to Senate
May, 2014

Committee members:

Abramson, Z. (Sociology)
Barr, S. (Geology)
Biro, A. (Social & Political Thought)
Brackney, W. (Theology)
Colton, J. / Warner, A. (Community Development)
Corbett, M. (Education)
Davison, K. (graduate student - PS)
Horvath, P. / Potter, S. (Psychology)
Mallory, M. (Biology)
MacKinnon, D. (Dean, RGS; Chair)
McFarland, S. (Chemistry)
Mendivil, F. / Chipman, H. (Math & Stats)
Roddis, I. (graduate student - PAS)
Spooner, I. (Applied Geomatics)
Sprado, L. (graduate student - A)
Trudel, A. (Computer Science)
Whetter, K. (English)
Whitehall, G. (Politics)
(graduate student - Theology; unfilled)

The Senate Committee on Graduate Studies met on two occasions during the 2012-2013 academic year: October 18 and January 28 (coordinators only; AGA awards). In addition, a Thesis Subcommittee and an AGA Subcommittee met on three occasions: November 4, December 4, and January 20. Regular (non-problematic) business was conducted electronically throughout the year. As there was little this year in the way of curriculum changes, policy initiatives, or new program discussions, the Committee was able to conduct most of its regular business on-line.

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

- *Curriculum changes.* Curriculum changes and program modifications to graduate programs in Biology, Education, Geology, and Psychology.
- *Subcommittees.* Establishment of subcommittees for SSHRC, Governor-General's Gold Medal, and NSHRF awards, as well as a Thesis Subcommittee and an AGA Subcommittee.
- *Thesis extensions.* Discussion of circumstances under which extensions will be granted to graduate students to compete theses.
- *AGA awards*. It was agreed that AGA awards would be allocated as previously, i.e., amounts would be allocated to faculties through Research & Graduate Studies, and allotments within faculties would be by discussion between/among each faculty's graduate coordinators. The maximum AGA amount would remain at $9,000 (maximum).

Submitted by: David MacKinnon, Chair, Senate Committee on Graduate Studies