

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 Monday 14th April, 2014

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 14th April, 2014 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 37 present, plus three guests.

1) Approval of Agenda

The Chair stated that before the agenda could be approved there were some changes to be requested.

Item 5)a) *Report from the Research Committee* would move to 5)d).

The Chair also stated that there was a Special Order in place for 5:40 p.m., at which point Senate would halt any business and receive the LibQual presentation. This had been requested because Melissa Scanlan had already attended two Senate meetings with this being her third, but the Chair pointed out that if Senate chose to over-ride the Special Order they could do so with a 2/3rds majority.

There were no objections to these changes.

Motion to approve the agenda as revised. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by G. Bissix.

AGENDA APPROVED AS REVISED.

2) Minutes of the Meeting of 10th March, 2014

Motion to approve the minutes of March 10th, 2014. Moved by S. Major, seconded by R. Perrins.

H. Wyle voiced some concern that wording on page 12 of the minutes did not sufficiently stress the fact that the APC motion could remain in effect for a period of one year only, whereas he had agreed to withdraw his motion only if that was the case.

The Chair assured H. Wyle that amendments to the motion would be invited at this Senate meeting. An amendment to have the APC motion remain in effect only for one year would be in order at this meeting.

C. Stanley stated that he had been the mover of the final motion at the March Senate meeting; his name was added to the minutes.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS REVISED CARRIED.

3) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

The Chair noted regrets from R. Ivany, J. Holt, G. Phillips, A. Vibert, C. Rushton, P. Connelly, J. Guiney Yallop, P. Doerr and E. Callaghan.

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

The Chair also welcomed C. Lathem, the incoming President of the ASU, and L. Murphy the incoming Vice President Academic, ASU, as guests.

There were no objections to the guests attending.

The Chair reported that she had met with the By-laws committee and that this would be dealt with later in the Senate meeting.

The Chair attended a Budget Advisory Committee meeting on behalf of Senate. The 2014-2015 projected budget had been approved by the Executive Committee of the Board and the budget would now be recommended to the Board of Governors. The Chair noted that at a recent Town Hall meeting, President Ivany had indicated that the Province was providing bi-lateral funding for the year 2013-14, which was received on March 31st, 2014. This allowed the deficit to be paid off and some other debts to be paid down, but at this stage, no additional funding had been promised for the 2014-15 budget year. The Chair noted that the Executive Committee of the Board had decided to budget assuming there will be some additional funding from the Province in 2014-15, but that even with that assumption, there would still be a deficit for 2014-15.

b) From the President

There was no report as President Ivany was not at Senate.

c) From the Vice-President Academic

T. Herman had no announcements.

4) Time-sensitive Items

a) Motion to amend Honours Thesis dates to March 30th (*attached*)

Motion that Senate amend the date for submission of Honours Thesis in the previously approved Calendar Dates to March 30th, for the 2014-2015 academic year. Moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by D. Benoit.

The Chair explained that this was an example of a motion to amend something that had been previously adopted. This could be done as long as the motion had not yet gone into effect, and only required a majority of Senators if proper Notice of Motion had been given, as it had in this case.

D. MacKinnon informed Senate that March 31st was the date that the Print Shop closed every year to carry out inventory and that Honours students needed the Print Shop to print their theses back to back. Moving the date to March 30th would avoid conflict.

MOTION APPROVED.

b) Motion that Senate approve the principle of

Motion that Senate approve the principle of awarding Aegrotat Standing, with the details as circulated. Moved by T. Herman,

awarding Aegrotat Standing (*attached*)

seconded by R. Perrins.

T. Herman stated that this was a common practice in many institutions and was a way to award degrees and to recognize students who had either died or had become permanently incapacitated. It was generally reserved for students that had completed three years of their program and were in good standing.

T. Herman noted that this practice had been applied very occasionally in the past without having formal Aegrotat Standing in place.

The Chair clarified that the Dean or VPA would put the student's name on a list, recommending that they be approved for Aegrotat Standing and it would be brought to Faculty and to Senate for approval.

G. Whitehall asked for clarification on the wording of the motion and asked whether it would show in the Constitution.

The Chair responded that the wording of the motion would go under Senate minutes.

G. Whitehall asked whether it would go into the Calendar.

D. Serafini agreed that this would be added to the Calendar and would become a policy that would be appended to what was required for Graduation.

In response to a question from A. Quema, G. Whitehall let Senate know that the word Aegrotat was from the Latin "he/she is ill".

MOTION CARRIED.

c) Motion that Senate approve the nomination for Dr. Peter McLeod to be awarded Professor Emeritus status (*previously circulated*)

Motion that Senate approve the nomination for Dr. Peter McLeod to be awarded Professor Emeritus status. Moved by H. Gardner, seconded by B. Brackney.

The Chair explained that this was a late nomination and that there were exceptional circumstances.

A secret ballot was conducted.

CANDIDATE FOR PROFESSOR EMERITUS STATUS APPROVED.

d) Report from the APC regarding Considerations for Assessing Permanent Faculty Position Requests (*attached*)

The Chair recapped that last month Senate had a 'Motion to Substitute' under consideration and was considering two motions. However, H. Wylie withdrew Motion A, leaving only Motion B, the revised motion from the APC, standing. This motion was now being moved and seconded and amendments would be allowable.

T. Herman commented that the APC recognized that the criteria would be in place for one year only and offered to alter the wording of the motion to read as follows:

Motion that Senate approve the Report from the APC regarding Considerations for Assessing Permanent Faculty Position Requests

(attached). These principles and factors will apply for the 2013/2014 academic year only. Moved by T. Herman, seconded by P. Williams.

G. Whitehall understood that Senate had agreed that there would be open Town Hall format for the discussions and consultation and asked whether this would occur in the fall of 2014. G. Whitehall felt there had also been an agreement to create conditions for a meaningful and reflective discussion around the university in order to get the mixture right. G. Whitehall noted that this was clearly the intent around the agreement to withdraw Motion A.

The Chair agreed that the minutes could reflect the fact that the intent was to have an open discussion of the APC document.

D. Seamone requested that this be put forward as an amendment.

Further consultation, including Town Hall meetings, will be held in the Fall semester, to have open discussion to establish longer term principles and factors. Moved by D. Seamone, seconded by G. Whitehall.

D. Benoit questioned waiting to begin discussion until the Fall, when faculty members would be busy. D. Benoit felt that the APC could start earlier in the year with Town Hall meetings.

Amendment to the amendment “including at least one Town Hall in the fall semester”. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by N. Clarke.

D. Seamone did not feel that the original wording of the amendment precluded an earlier meeting. If a cross-faculty gathering was wanted, some sectors would not be included if meetings occurred in the summer.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT CARRIED.

Further consultation, including at least one Town Hall meeting in the fall semester, will occur to have open discussion to establish longer term principles and factors.

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

Discussion returned to the main motion with the following approved amendments:

Motion that Senate approve the Report from the APC regarding Considerations for Assessing Permanent Faculty Position Requests (attached). These principles and factors will apply for the 2013/2014 academic year only. Further consultation, including at least one Town Hall meeting in the fall semester, will occur to have open discussion to establish longer term principles and factors.

G. Whitehall requested a discussion of the proposed amendments to the Motion from the APC, requesting changes to the wording in Point #1, 4, 2 and 3.

The Chair invited G. Whitehall to propose one amendment at a time.

Amendment #1: **Motion to change the wording in the preamble from “*In making permanent faculty position requests, Senate will endeavor to:*”**

to instead read: “*In making permanent faculty position recommendations, the APC will:*”

Moved by G. Whitehall, seconded by D. Seamone.

P. Williams noted that he would vote against the amendment, because the original language had been written to make it clear that the APC was subservient to Senate and that part of its mandate was to make recommendations to Senate.

D. Seamone felt that the amendment clarified things. Senate had goals and responsibilities already defined in the Constitution.

A. Quema noted that the four points in the APC Motion constituted a mechanism whereby Senate would decide on the recommendations from the APC. Senate had a mechanism by which it would accept or reject whatever ranking was proposed through the APC.

H. Wylie agreed with the wording of the amendment.

A. Quema felt that if these four points constituted a mechanism by which Senators were going to make a decision, confusion derived from the fact that Senators would not be sure what criteria the APC was going to use to provide the ranking. The first four points covered the way in which Senate was going to respond to the ranking. The other three factors were what the APC would use when assessing permanent faculty position requests.

T. Herman stated that academic integrity was the purview of Senate and the APC was clearly subservient in that regard. Senate would be making the actual requests for positions.

D. Seamone asked why the APC motion did not begin with “The APC shall use the following factors...”

G. Whitehall appreciated the clarification from T. Herman, and agreed to withdraw his amendment.

The Chair asked whether there were any objections.

There were none.

Amendment withdrawn.

Amendment #2: Motion to strike the whole first part of the APC motion – Point #1, 2, 3 and 4. Moved by G. Whitehall, seconded by H. Wylie.

G. Whitehall felt that the final decision rested with the VP Academic.

H. Wylie agreed that the first four points appeared to direct Senate on how to think about these positions.

A. Quema noted a discrepancy between the first four points and then the next three points by which the APC would make decisions. The APC would make

decisions based on a set of criteria, but Senate would make a decision based on other kinds of criteria.

The Chair reminded Senators that this approach would be in place for one year only.

A. Quema asked whether wording in Point #4 '*Support the integrity of the varying pedagogical practices*' would in fact be a factor in the APC's deliberations. A. Quema noted that the TTTCAC deliberations were based on the consideration of various criteria, and not every decision was based on FCEs. There was, however, concreteness to the approach, compared to the rather general approach here, and the discrepancy between the two lists.

G. Whitehall stated that the goal of Senate was to make the best policy possible, and that this policy was confusing. The criteria that A. Quema would like to see should be in the second half of the Motion from the APC, but was presently in the first half of the motion. Items such as inter-disciplinary synergies, program capacity development or pedagogical practice should be put into what would now become the second half of the motion.

A. Quema noted that the decision was unusual, in that Senate now had the opportunity to have a say in this process. Two scenarios were possible. One would be that Senate decided against having anything to do with the process and the other was that Senate remained involved in the process. If Senate was to be involved, there would have to be a debate in Senate. A. Quema felt that the first part of the APC motion was an attempt to create a framework in which this discussion could take place. Some Senators were saying that they wanted to be in a position to decide what basis would be used to vote on tenure track positions. Senate would have to come up with a process to make this work, in order to avoid a certain amount of chaos.

M. Rios agreed that this was what created a framework for a discussion for the future. M. Rios felt that the APC was not directing Senate and asked the movers of the original motion to explain what the intent of the first four principles in the APC motion really meant.

T. Herman responded that the intention was to create a structure for a conversation around requests coming forward from departments. This was not an exclusive list.

D. Benoit saw the first four principles as a way for the APC to frame the types of things that they were going to do. This would mean that when the APC recommendations came back to Senate they would have kept these four points in mind. This was not an inclusive list, because that would invite the chaos that was mentioned earlier.

D. Benoit did not feel that this list was a negative thing and did not see the first four points as the APC telling Senate how to act.

D. Seamone appreciated T. Herman's clarification and felt that if the wording of the first line was altered, she would not have a negative reaction and would not therefore be supporting the amendment.

B. Anderson agreed.

S. Major suggested keeping the four principles but suggested adding the

wording '*the APC Sub-Committee of Senate and Senate will endeavor to*' to the wording in the preamble.

The Chair stated that these changes could be made as a further amendment after Senate dealt with the current amendment.

D. Seamone asked whether the APC members were interested in changing the preamble and clarifying it, since it might change both the discussion and the proposed amendment.

A. Quema stated that she would propose an amendment once this amendment had been voted on, to say '*in making permanent faculty position requests, Senate will consider principles such as:*'

The Chair asked T. Herman whether he would be open to some reframing of the wording of the APC motion, to make it clearer the original principles were not an exclusive list.

T. Herman was agreeable to this.

Question called on Amendment #2.

AMENDMENT FAILED.

Motion to amend the main motion to read as follows:

Motion that Senate approve the Report from the APC regarding Considerations for Assessing Permanent Faculty Position Requests (attached). These principles and factors will apply for the 2013/2014 academic year only. Further consultation, including at least one Town Hall meeting in the fall semester, will occur to have open discussion to establish longer term principles and factors. *In making permanent faculty position requests, Senate will consider principles such as:* Moved by A. Quema, seconded by B. Latta.

A. Quema noted that based on the earlier discussions, if Senate was making a request or recommendation, there needed to be a framework within which a discussion could take place, without dictating each and every principle or deliberation.

G. Whitehall agreed that the amendment might lessen the degree of chaos and provide more management of the process. G. Whitehall felt that there was little likelihood that Senate would deliberate every proposal from the APC on the basis of these principles. He felt that it needed to be built into the process of the APC itself. G. Whitehall doubted Senate's ability to engage in debate on all tenure track positions without Senators' positions being whipped. Recommendations coming from the APC needed to have a bearing on the values that Senate had established.

G. Whitehall felt that the contingent factors in the motion were too general.

Motion to amend the amendment to read '*In making permanent faculty position requests, Senate and the APC will consider principles such as:* Moved by G. Whitehall, seconded by S. Major.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT APPROVED.

Senate now returned to discussion of the amendment to the main motion.

H. Wylie did not feel that the APC should be dictating the terms in which Senate should be thinking about something, because the APC was a sub-committee of Senate. H. Wylie felt that Senate should be deliberating the principles that the APC should consider. Senate should be removed from the preamble.

H. Wylie felt that if Senate decided that these were the principles that the APC should consider when making their recommendations on faculty positions, then Senate would be exercising its authority to set the terms by which both Senate and the APC think about positions.

A. Quema pointed out that the reason for her amendment was to address this kind of problem. This was the sort of language that was used in Calendar course descriptions, when a statement such as 'this course will cover topics including ...' was used. The attempt was to provide a list that was open ended, in order to provide a framework for a discussion at Senate.

P. Williams commented that this was trying to get a framework for the conversation, so that the APC was clear about what Senate was interested in hearing about when the recommendations came forward. Senate was deciding this.

AMENDMENT TO THE MAIN MOTION APPROVED.

Senate returned to discussion of the main motion.

G. Whitehall understood that the APC would receive recommendations from the departments and that departments could make those requests in any way that best represented their request. This would create plenty of discussion at the APC level. G. Whitehall was concerned that when departments saw the criteria that would be applied to the recommendations that they had sent forward, they would find that these were three very broad principles. Principle #1 asked for alignment with the definition of an Acadia Education. Principle #2 was more specific to the department needs. Principle #3 looked at how it supported institutional sustainability i.e. could Acadia afford the position from an overall perspective.

G. Whitehall did not feel that department heads should be considering whether their needs were a burden on the finances of the University. The department needed to focus on their needs in order to deliver their programs well.

G. Whitehall encouraged Senate to consider what they would like to see in the contingent factors in the second half of the motion.

A. Quema asked whether departments were expected to take those three factors into consideration and build their case based on those three factors. If this was the case, A. Quema agreed that Principle #3 was not helpful to a department.

T. Herman stated that the last paragraph described the expectation to the units and noted that requests should address the first two principles in particular. T. Herman noted that at the APC level, the committee needed to consider

institutional sustainability.

G. Whitehall felt that matters of institutional sustainability would be decided by the administration, in terms of the number of positions that would be given to the APC to rank, as opposed to the APC deciding on the financial sustainability of a program. If it was in fact the latter, G. Whitehall wished to propose an amendment to the wording of Principle #3.

The Chair explained that an amendment could be made after other Senators on the speaker's list, who had not yet spoken to the main motion, had their turns.

S. Henderson also felt that the jurisdiction of Senate did not include financial resources, and felt that Principle #3 was superfluous.

A. Quema felt that a paradoxical creature had been created. If, as G. Whitehall suggested, there was a clear distinction between Senate and its purview over academic programs, and the Board with its purview over financial decision, then the APC now bridged the gap between the purview of the Board and the purview of Senate.

D. Seamone felt that Principle #3 asked Senators to police themselves, and narrow their imagination of what was required too soon. Senate's job was to make a strong case for what was required from an academic basis.

J. Wood felt that a lot of provisos were being added to a discussion that was only going to apply for one year. He felt that Principle #3 avoided procedural circularity, because if recommendations went to the Board and were then returned because of financial constraints, a lot of time would have been spent unnecessarily by Senate.

V. Zamlynnny suggested the following amendment:

Amendment to the wording of Principle #3 to say '*How does it support institutional sustainability (can Acadia afford it from an academic perspective)*'". Moved by V. Zamlynnny, seconded by D. Seamone.

A. Quema commented that she felt the mover meant to say '*academic sustainability*' from the debate that had taken place, which meant something very different from '*institutional sustainability*'.

M. Rios pointed out that during the last two years, Senate had continued to advocate for more of a connection with the Board. Senate had requested more communication with the Board so that they understood the decisions the Board was making and the Board understood decisions made by Senate. This change in the wording would create an adversarial relationship which was not supposed to be the case in a bicameral situation. M. Rios felt the argument around the APC and Senate was circular, but that at the end of the day it was quite clear that the APC served at the pleasure of Senate.

AMENDMENT FAILED.

Discussion returned to the main motion.

G. Whitehall asked the movers of the main motion how they proposed to evaluate and how they imagined that the APC would evaluate and use Principle

#3.

T. Herman responded that the intent was to optimize academic programming within the finite resource base in which the University had to operate. To do that, the APC would not just look at the cost of a particular program in isolation, since he recognized that some programs cost more to deliver than other programs, as would be the case in any other institution. The APC will look instead at whether resources were being appropriately allocated across all programs, to allow the institution as a whole to succeed.

R. Perrins noted that everyone would have different ways to evaluate any position request, as was the case on the TTTCAC. He expected that there would be broad representation from different units across the campus that would result in lengthy discussion and be followed by more discussion at Senate.

Discussion returned again to the main motion.

G. Whitehall proposed the following amendment: **Motion to change the wording of Principle #3 to ‘How does it support institutional sustainability and program integrity’.** Moved by G. Whitehall, seconded by A. Quema.

P. Williams stated that he would vote against the amendment because Principle #2 spoke to specifics that applied to programs, whereas Principle #3 looked at ways to optimize the entire package and be as effective as possible.

AMENDMENT FAILED.

D. Seamone requested that Senate address her motion which had been on the table of Senate since January, and asked how likely this was.

The Chair noted that the Special Order at 5:40 p.m. would be occurring in one minute, and that it therefore looked unlikely that there would be time to get to other items on the agenda.

The main motion now read as follows:

Motion that Senate approve the Report from the APC regarding Considerations for Assessing Permanent Faculty Position Requests. These principles and factors will apply for the 2013/2014 academic year only. Further consultation, including at least one Town Hall meeting in the fall semester, will occur to have open discussion to establish longer term principles and factors.

In making permanent faculty position requests, Senate and the APC will consider principles such as:

- 1) Ensure there is a viable and diverse set of academic programs;**
- 2) Foster potential for interdisciplinary synergies;**
- 3) Realize greatest impact for program/subject area/capability development;**
- 4) Support the integrity of the varying pedagogical practices, within a framework of overall sustainability.**

The APC will use the following factors in assessing permanent faculty

position requests as part of its mandate to make recommendations to Senate, with supporting rationale, on hiring priorities.

The factors are:

- 1) Alignment with the definition of an Acadia Education and Acadia's Mission and Vision (How does it contribute to the achievement of Acadia's goals and priorities?),
- 2) Program/Subject Area/Capability Requirements (What do we need to do it well?), and
- 3) How does it support institutional sustainability (Can Acadia afford it from an overall perspective?).

It is recognized that we value diversity in our academic programming and that requests will exhibit variability in the degree to which each factor is addressed. Requests will be assessed on all three factors and each must be present to some degree. Requests should explicitly address the first two points in detail.

MOTION APPROVED, WITH AMENDMENTS AS INCLUDED ABOVE.

It now being 5:40 p.m., the Chair asked Senate whether they would like to hear the LibQual presentation and follow the orders of the day, or continue on with the rest of the agenda, since there were several other time sensitive items that had also been on the agenda since January.

W. Brackney informed Senate that the Library committee would be meeting on Wednesday and discussing the LibQual presentation at that meeting.

The Chair requested that Senate vote either to continue on with the LibQual presentation (follow the orders of the day), or to continue with other items on the agenda.

Senate voted in favour of continuing with other items on the agenda.

- e) Motion from the APC to extend the original submission deadlines to April 30th and to the June meeting of Senate. *(attached)*

Motion from the APC to extend the original submission deadlines to April 30th and to the June meeting of Senate. Moved by T. Herman, seconded by P. Williams.

Whereas the original submission date for requests to the APC was February 15, and

Whereas units will need to be aware of the criteria for assessment, and
Whereas Senate has not (as of March 3, 2014) approved a set of criteria
Be it resolved that, for the 2013-2014 academic year,

- 1) the deadline for position request submissions to the APC be extended to April 30,
- 2) the APC shall bring to Senate a recommendation for the June meeting of Senate, and
- 3) Senate shall submit a final list to the VP-Academic no later than July 1.

T. Herman explained that the deadline for submissions from the departments

to the APC would be extended to April 30th, and that deadlines for the APC recommendations to Senate would be extended to the date of the June Senate meeting.

MOTION APPROVED.

- f) Motion that Senate establish an Ad hoc Interdisciplinary Program Committee (*attached*)

Motion that Senate establish an Ad hoc Interdisciplinary Program Committee. Moved by D. Seamone, seconded by A. Quema.

WHEREAS the Coordinators of the interdisciplinary programs at Acadia have identified numerous shared challenges affecting the administration and promotion of their programs and their ability to offer necessary and sufficient courses, and

WHEREAS these challenges arise from the lack of representation and ill-defined status and governance of IDST programs,

BE IT MOVED THAT Senate establish an Interdisciplinary Program Committee that will make proposals for
(a) the rationalized governance and administration of IDST programs;
(b) the representation of IDST faculty on major decision-making committees, including hiring committees to ensure that IDST programs are supported when hiring is done;
(c) the support of IDST programs through curriculum visibility, flexibility, and procedures such as systematic cross-listing and cross-coding;
and
(d) mechanisms by which departments will be advantaged by supporting interdisciplinary studies and programs.

BE IT FURTHER MOVED THAT the proposed committee be composed of a representative from each of the IDST programs chosen by the respective IDST program, as well as a faculty representative from each of the faculties, elected via the appropriate faculty elections officer.

D. Seamone was making the motion on behalf of the six IDST program coordinators at Acadia. Women and Gender Studies began over 40 years ago and underwent its first program review last year. As a result of that program review, the Women and Gender Studies program made a presentation to the APC and requested that an Ad hoc committee be created in a reasonable time frame. This would come back to Senate with some kind of structure that would enable IDST programs to better act within the University structure.

D. Shea asked whether a student could sit on the Ad hoc committee.

D. Seamone agreed that this would be in order, and agreed to alter the wording to state:

BE IT FURTHER MOVED THAT the proposed committee be composed of a representative from each of the IDST programs chosen by the respective IDST program, as well as a faculty representative from each of the faculties, elected via the appropriate faculty elections officer, and a student representative, preferably from an IDST program, as chosen by the SRC.

There were no objections to adding this wording to the motion.

P. Williams asked for a list of the six IDST programs on campus.

D. Seamone stated they were as follows:

- Women and Gender Studies
- Environment and Sustainability Studies
- Environmental Sciences
- Comparative Religion
- Social and Political Thought
- Canadian Studies

A. Quema stated that when Women and Gender Studies met initially with the APC, they shared the idea that the APC would bring forward the motion; but that they were instead encouraged to bring this motion forward themselves. A. Quema noted that they had a discussion about how to include a student on the committee. Because this was an Ad hoc committee, nothing would be written in stone in terms of membership and the composition might change.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Chair suggested that next year, when it was time for the annual Senate committee reports, if the committee had not already reported back to Senate, the Ad hoc committee could then report, and recommend whether it should continue as an ad hoc committee into the following year, disband, or become a standing committee. There were no objections to this plan, which would go into the minutes.

g) **Motion to separate the School of Recreation Management and Kinesiology into a School of Kinesiology and a Department of Community Development (*attached*)**

Motion to separate the School of Recreation Management and Kinesiology into a School of Kinesiology and a Department of Community Development. Moved by G. Bissix, seconded by R. Murphy.

The Chair provided background on research she had conducted while looking through previous Senate minutes for precedents, in order to ensure that proper procedures were adopted in this case. Although the Food Science program was dissolved, and the School of Nutrition and Dietetics formed under its current name in 1999, the Chair found no report of the change having passed through Senate.

The Chair noted that since the Terms of Reference for Senate state that Senate is “responsible for the educational policy of the University, and, with the approval of the Board of Governors insofar as the expenditure of funds and the establishment of faculties are concerned, may create such faculties, schools, departments and institutes....as the Senate may determine.” The Chair felt that if Senate had the authority to create schools and departments, that it also had the authority to subdivide, amalgamate, or close schools and departments. This same reasoning can be observed by a former Senate Chair, Professor Agar Adamson, in the minutes of December 1997, when asked to rule on a potential amalgamation of two schools.

The Chair therefore felt that the decision should ultimately be made by Senate.

However, there is no specific precedent available as to the route it should take to get to Senate. One option was to follow the usual route for curriculum changes, which was the route taken in this instance. The change had been approved by the School of Recreation Management and Kinesiology, the FPS Planning Committee, the FPS Faculty Council, and sent to the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee felt that it was not necessary for them to approve the change, as there were no associated curriculum changes (they had already been approved in previous years). Therefore, Senate was the appropriate next step. In addition to coming to Senate, this request would be going to the Board of Governors.

The Chair stated also that the Act of Incorporation for Acadia University included the following wording “the board may establish and manage professional, and technical, and other schools, and may support the same out of the funds of the university”. Thus, Senate seems to have sole authority to create (and by extension, to amalgamate or dissolve) departments, but both Senate and the Board seem to have the authority to create schools.

Finally, the Chair had pointed out to T. Herman, G. Bissix and R. Murphy that the issue of Senate representation from these units would require attention. From a Senate perspective, the Faculty of Professional Studies was entitled to nine representatives, with at least one from each school. However, the FPS Constitution only allows for Senate representation from Schools; there is no mention in the FPS Constitution of departments. This will be given attention by the FPS.

In speaking to the motion, R. Murphy explained that ‘Community Development’ was not part of the School’s name, and that there was now less cross over between the two program course offerings, as SRMK courses no longer existed with the exception of activity labs.

R. Murphy noted that this will result in fewer meetings at the school level and remove a layer of administration that was really not needed.

S. Major asked whether the constitution of the FPS allowed for a change of this nature.

G. Bissix responded that some changes to the constitution would need to be made and agreed upon, once Senate had approved the change.

S. Major asked whether if Senate approved this change, they could be supporting a department that didn’t belong to a Faculty.

G. Bissix agreed that this could be the case.

P. Williams felt that although there could be a period of limbo, it was unlikely that the change would be implemented until such time as all approvals had been made.

The Chair believed that Senate was responsible for approving changes to a Faculty constitution. It was clarified that any changes to Faculty constitutions were to be reported to Senate, so Senate would have an opportunity to review the changes at a later point.

D. MacKinnon asked whether there would be both a School Director and a Department Head, and asked whether changes would be coming forward to

the Graduate degree which was currently a Master of Recreation Management.

R. Murphy agreed that the School was working on that.

B. Anderson asked whether there was currently a Head of Community Development. R. Murphy confirmed that there was not at this time, but that one of the current faculty members would step into that role.

A. Quema liked the idea of a School of Community Development and asked why there was a distinction between a School and a Department.

R. Murphy responded that they had consulted with the VP Academic, the Dean, the Registrar and members of the School and had decided that this would be the most useful structure moving forward.

G. Whitehall has interested to see whether the Department of Community Development would remain, or whether it would later become an inter-disciplinary program. G. Whitehall asked whether this had been the result of a recommendation from an academic review and wondered whether it had been an external recommendation. G. Whitehall was concerned that the Department of Community Development could find they were unable to achieve the level of program integrity and viability now that it was not attached to Kinesiology, or a part of the School.

T. Herman stated that the FPS Planning Committee had fully endorsed this change and were fully aware of the need to change language in the FPS Constitution. The Academic Program Review of the SRMK did comment on the devolution of the two units from a more common origin.

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion to adjourn at 6:10 p.m., moved by C. Stanley.

The Chair reminded Senators of the Notice of Motion for Chair and Deputy Chair of Senate. P. Doerr had been nominated for Chair of Senate and a Deputy Chair was still needed. Senators were asked to consider nominating a Senator for this position.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Motion to amend a previously-approved Senate motion, regarding Honours thesis dates:

Last year (2012-2013), Senate established a deadline of March 31st for submission of Honours theses to Research & Graduate Studies. At that time, we were unaware that this is the date when the Acadia Print Shop closes for its annual inventory. In order to accommodate student printing needs in future, without further reducing the time available to external readers, I move that Senate change that date in the previously approved Calendar Dates to March 30th, for the 2014-2015 academic year.

David MacKinnon
Dean of Research & Graduate Studies

Motion: Aegrotat Standing

Aegrotat standing may be awarded in rare cases in which a student, based on serious medical or similar evidence, is unable to complete program requirements within a reasonable time, or at all. The designation is normally applied toward the end of a student's degree program, and may result in the awarding of an Aegrotat degree.

An Aegrotat degree is awarded only to students in good standing who have been unable to complete their program due to extraordinary and extenuating medical circumstances, usually resulting in death or permanent incapacitation. Normally, at least 75 per cent of the requirements for a credential must be successfully completed, with the balance fulfilled through the awarding of Aegrotat standing.

Aegrotat standing is rarely granted. A formal request must be submitted to the Dean of the faculty in which the student is registered during their graduating year. The approval of the Dean and the Vice President Academic is necessary to grant this status.

Tom Herman

2014.04.04

Motion from the Academic Planning Committee

In making permanent faculty position requests, Senate will endeavour to:

- 1) Ensure there is a viable and diverse set of academic programs;
- 2) Foster potential for interdisciplinary synergies;
- 3) Realize greatest impact for program/subject area/capability development;
- 4) Support the integrity of the varying pedagogical practices, within a framework of overall sustainability.

The APC will use the following factors in assessing permanent faculty position requests as part of its mandate to make recommendations to Senate, with supporting rationale, on hiring priorities.

The factors are:

- 1) Alignment with the definition of an Acadia Education and Acadia's Mission and Vision (How does it contribute to the achievement of Acadia's goals and priorities?),
- 2) Program/Subject Area/Capability Requirements (What do we need to do it well?), and
- 3) How does it support institutional sustainability (Can Acadia afford it from an overall perspective?).

It is recognized that we value diversity in our academic programming and that requests will exhibit variability in the degree to which each factor is addressed. Requests will be assessed on all three factors and each must be present to some degree. Requests should explicitly address the first two points in detail.

Motion that the original submission dates for requests to the APC be extended:

Whereas the original submission date for requests to the APC was February 15, and

Whereas units will need to be aware of the criteria for assessment, and

Whereas Senate has not (as of March 3, 2014) approved a set of criteria

Be it resolved that, for the 2013-2014 academic year,

- 4) the deadline for position request submissions to the APC be extended to April 30,
- 5) the APC shall bring to Senate a recommendation for the June meeting of Senate, and
- 6) Senate shall submit a final list to the VP-Academic no later than July 1.

Motion that Senate establish an Ad hoc Interdisciplinary Program Committee

WHEREAS the Coordinators of the interdisciplinary programs at Acadia have identified numerous shared challenges affecting the administration and promotion of their programs and their ability to offer necessary and sufficient courses, and

WHEREAS these challenges arise from the lack of representation and ill-defined status and governance of IDST programs,

BE IT MOVED THAT Senate establish an Interdisciplinary Program Committee that will make proposals for

- (a) the rationalized governance and administration of IDST programs;
- (b) the representation of IDST faculty on major decision-making committees, including hiring committees to ensure that IDST programs are supported when hiring is done;
- (c) the support of IDST programs through curriculum visibility, flexibility, and procedures such as systematic cross-listing and cross-coding;

and

- (d) mechanisms by which departments will be advantaged by supporting interdisciplinary studies and programs.

BE IT FURTHER MOVED THAT the proposed committee be composed of a representative from each of the IDST programs chosen by the respective IDST program, as well as a faculty representative from each of the faculties, elected via the appropriate faculty elections officer.

A Motion to devolve the School of Recreation Management and Kinesiology into a School of Kinesiology and a Department of Community Development.

The Faculty of Professional Studies (FPS) based on a unanimous vote of the FPS Council recommends to the Senate of Acadia University

Motion: That the Senate of Acadia University approve a change in the administrative structure of the School of Recreation Management and Kinesiology to the School of Kinesiology and the Department of Community Development.

This recommendation follows a unanimous recommendation from the FPS Planning Committee and a unanimous affirmative vote in the SRMK Faculty Council. This recommendation is based on the following rationale and procedures followed within SRMK.

Background:

Since 1974 there has been no appreciable overlap in core curriculum content in the School's degree programs and common elective course concentrations and other electives have decreased substantially over time. Other than the fact that both undergraduate degree programs administered by the School have a professional orientation, there are no appreciable theoretical, conceptual or procedural underpinnings to the programs that bind the School together. While coexistence has been generally amicable, the unprecedented growth in student enrolment in the Kinesiology program and the recent and substantive change in program emphasis of the previous Bachelor of Recreation Management to the Bachelor of Community Development has led to a need to reorganize the administration of the degree programs to more effectively support them.

While the Kinesiology program presently has high student demand, it lives in a highly competitive degree granting environment locally within Nova Scotia, regionally within Atlantic Canada, and nationally across Canada. To ensure the competitiveness and sustainability of the Kinesiology program which is also critical to continued health of the University as a whole, the Kinesiology faculty must fully focus on the affairs that directly concern program quality in the Bachelor of Kinesiology degree.

While the Bachelor of Recreation Management maintained essentially steady recruitment over the past two decades, the regional and national trend was a steady decline in demand for recreation management degree programs and an increasing demand for professionals more broadly trained in Community Development. Hence the reason why a change in degree to a Bachelor of Community Development was sought and approved by MPHEC this past summer (2013). To be successful with this transition, the Community Development faculty must concentrate on developing a strong supportive professional community, supportive geographical communities and communities of interest, and focus marketing in an arena with little track record.

The benefits of separating the two degree programs into two distinct administrative units include increased accountability internally and with their respective professional constituencies, a sharper focus for marketing and promotional strategies, ability to focus directly on building the two professional

constituencies, and increased ability to build academic linkages across campus and with other higher education institutions.

The Transitional Plan:

A committee co-led by the Dean of FPS and the Director, with a faculty representative from each of the Kinesiology and Community Development programs as well as a staff representative presented a transition plan that was unanimously accepted by the Kinesiology Faculty Council and the Community Development Faculty Council, and was subsequently ratified by a unanimous vote of the full SRMK Faculty Council. This was followed by consultation with the Vice-president Academic who provided advice on procedural matters.

Resource Implications:

The plan for disassociation will be phased in over the next twelve months with no new demands on support staff, offices and office equipment. The established program budget has been appropriated equitably among the two programs. Separating the units removes an ongoing level of administrative work and meetings at the "School" level, which was extra work for all faculty in the school.

For further background on the history of the School please refer to the addendum below:

The journey to today's school began in the fall of 1890 when a new gymnasium was built at Acadia. In 1910, an introductory and required course in physical education was formed. From 1911 until 1914 all first year students were required to take the Physical Training course as a requirement for a Bachelor of Arts degree. During World War One the course was removed but returned in 1921. At this time all first and second year students were required to take this course for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees.

In the early 1920's the Department of Physical Education was formed within the Faculty of Arts. In September 1969 the name was changed to the Department of Physical Education and Recreation which offered a Bachelor of Science in Recreation and Physical Education. In June 1974 the Department changed its name to the School of Recreation and Physical Education. Also that year Senate approved the establishment of a master's degree in Recreation. With the focus on kinesiology growing in Canada, in 1997 the School again changed its name to the School of Recreation Management and Kinesiology. The School now offered a Bachelor of Recreation Management (BRM) and a Bachelor of Kinesiology (BKin).

In 2007, the Recreation Management faculty began focusing more on Community Development in their curriculum.

The two undergraduate programs undertook the Senate review process in 2009. After lengthy delays, Senate approved the review documents in 2011 and some important and significant changes were implemented. The kinesiology program was also externally reviewed for accreditation in 2004 and re-accredited in 2011.

The implementation of some of the mandated changes led to the creation of a new degree in Community Development to eventually replace the Bachelor of Recreation Management.

In 2013, the change from the Bachelor of Recreation Management degree to a Bachelor of Community Development was approved by MPHEC.

The School now offers an accredited Bachelor of Kinesiology and a Bachelor of Community Development. For the next few years, students who were admitted to the Bachelor of Recreation Management and wish to remain in this degree program can complete this degree.

The resulting structure and School name, no longer meet the needs of its constituents.