



Minutes of the Senate meeting of Monday 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2013

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 41 present.

**1) Approval of Agenda**

The Chair requested that item 6)b) *Calendar Dates for 2014-2015* be removed from the agenda as no member of the TIE committee could be present. D. Benoit also pointed out that there were errors in the dates in the original document, and he agreed to make the committee aware of any errors.

**Motion to approve the agenda as revised. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by H. Gardner.**

MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA AS REVISED CARRIED.

**2) Minutes of the Meeting of 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2013**

**Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2013 as distributed. Moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by S. Henderson.**

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES CARRIED.

**3) Announcements**

**a) From the Chair of Senate**

Regrets were received from R. Murphy, D. Seamone, J. Holt, J. MacLeod, W. Brackney, D. Serafini, E. Callaghan, B. Perrins, M. Snyder, B. Ells.

The Chair welcomed P. Connelly to Senate as the Lay Person representative. The Chair also welcomed J. Wood to Senate as the Theology Student representative.

The Chair reported that she had recently attended a Budget Advisory Committee meeting and that the discussion had centered on the current fiscal year and the way in which the actual spend was tracking compared to the projections. Deferred maintenance projects and 'curb appeal' projects had taken place over the summer months and these were described to the committee. The Chair noted that a small amount of funding had been earmarked for classroom renovations. An on-line survey was distributed to faculty and resulted in 75 responses. The Chair has passed these to D. Youden and M. Falkenham for action. The December Budget Advisory committee meeting will be discussing savings that have been realised when tenured or tenure track faculty retire or leave, and CLT or part-time faculty are hired in their place.

The Chair also met with the By-laws committee at their request and noted that B. Anderson would be reporting on that later in the Senate meeting.

**b) From the President**

President Ivany informed Senators that the Ontario government had recently issued a new differentiation policy framework for post-secondary education. President Ivany noted that it was representative of the type of policy changes occurring Province by Province and suggested that the APC or another Senate committee might wish to study the document and evaluate the impacts that a policy such as this might have on Acadia, were it to be introduced in Nova Scotia.

President Ivany believed that the Nova Scotia government could move in a similar direction in the next five years. Harvey Weingarten, President of the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, was involved in the developmental work on this policy and President Ivany noted that he met with the Nova Scotia government and the universities as part of the MOU process earlier this year.

The document will be circulated to Senators.

G. Whitehall asked how Senate could create or shape an academic envelope to affect how the Administration went into Collective Bargaining. G. Whitehall also asked how Senate could create the conversations or boundaries that would allow Senate to direct how the Administration went into negotiations.

President Ivany suggested that the Recording Secretary re-capture his wording from the previous meeting of Senate, when the same question had been answered, so that an amendment could be made to the minutes of November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

President Ivany did comment that there was much that Senate could do within the bicameral structure in terms of setting academic priorities around the planning process that had recently been re-invigorated. He noted that it would not be appropriate, however, for Senate to step into what was a legal requirement for the Employer and Employee in terms of bargaining. President Ivany stated that it was an important function of Senate to set academic priorities that would then inform subsequent budget and policy decisions.

President Ivany also expressed a desire to have Senate function similarly to the Board of Governors with respect to consideration of policy options i.e., proposals would come forward from the administration and be rigorously evaluated before Senate ultimately decided to adopt, amend or reject.

P. Williams stated that the idea of Senate directing the Administration on how to conduct negotiations would be anathema for the Faculty Association.

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

T. Herman announced that the next U4 event would be on January 24<sup>th</sup>-26<sup>th</sup>, 2014, entitled "The Leadership Incubator at X". This meeting was designed to explore leadership from many perspectives, but primarily focused on student leadership. T. Herman stated that J. Sanford would be organising Acadia's participation in the event.

The second U4 event would be the following weekend of January 31<sup>st</sup> – Feb 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014, at Bishop's University. This session would be entitled "Up for Debate" and would be a series of TEDx presentations with each university sending four students and a faculty member for the debate tournament and one or two TEDx speakers. The focus this year would be on 'mind and body'.

T. Herman noted that Dr. David Goldbloom would be presenting one of the TEDx talks, and that Mark Tewksbury and Debbie Muir would be keynote speakers.

#### 4) Priority Items

##### a) Report from Senate Research Committee

The Chair reviewed Robert's Rules of Order and noted that it was not designed to allow in-depth, back-and-forth discussion; instead, it was designed to make sure everyone's voice was heard. Since Senators only got two turns, they should make their turn count. Simple requests for information, however, would not normally count towards their two turns.

D. MacKinnon reminded Senators of the process that was started last year and noted that it had not been well subscribed to. As a result, D. MacKinnon offered instead to pull information from the Research and Graduate Studies data files relating to a five year period, and also go back to individual Schools and Departments. D. MacKinnon reported that he now had 226 differing codes for research conducted at Acadia and that he was in the process of deciding on a number of themes. He would be taking these back to the Senate Research committee.

D. MacKinnon had also received additional responses from units.

##### b) Report from the By-laws Committee

B. Anderson reported that the Bi-Laws committee was continuing to review committee structures. The committee recently lost their Chair, and H. Wylie had recently joined the committee. B. Anderson stressed that the committee members recognised that their task was to compromise between the importance of each committee's work, balanced against the tension that came as a result of competing demands and the fact that many people believed that there were too many committees. The By-laws committee saw their role as one of providing options that would provide for a more efficient, effective structure, with the Senate *Terms of Reference* as the foundation. The committee had examined the Terms of Reference, the existing committees' mandates, spoken with the Chairs of the sub-committees and requested feedback from them; in addition to starting to look at Senate committees in the U4 universities, to examine their structure.

B. Anderson noted that the By-laws committee looked at the existing sub-committees to determine whether they were aligned with the mandate of Senate. One recommendation that the By-laws committee would likely make was that some standing committees could perhaps be more effective were they to function as an Ad-hoc committee with a specific task assigned. B. Anderson gave the Academic Integrity Committee as an example, since it had not met for the past three years, yet there seemed to be tasks to be done in that domain.

B. Anderson stated that the committee also looked at whether some current committees might in fact not fall under Senate's mandate. The committee will formulate some initial proposals for reform, will meet with the Senate Executive to solidify these proposals further, and then come back to Senate with a set of recommendations.

A. Quema expressed concern that the job of the committee still get done. A. Quema found that most of the work on Senate committees was expected to be

done over the Fall and Winter terms, rather than being spread throughout the year. Committees might perhaps be more productive if there was an expectation that some committee work could be done in the spring, for example.

S. Major noted that there were a number of inactive committees, e.g.: the Faculty Development Committee, and the Academic Technology Committee.

M. Rios was pleased to see the conversation turn towards how Senate could complete its work efficiently, rather than simply focusing on eliminating committees.

5) Brought forward from  
November 18 meeting

a) Report from the AAU  
Coordinating Committee  
on Faculty Development

S. Major recently attended the AAU Coordinating Committee on Faculty Development at Mt. Allison and noted that representatives from Maritime universities were all present. This committee coordinates and reports on faculty development and also coordinates the AAU Teaching Awards and the AAU Distinguished Teaching Award in Education and Leadership.

S. Major noted that Acadia does not seem to be very well resourced compared to other universities. Some actually had faculty development staff working within their offices of research and graduate studies. Staff were appointed to coordinate teaching award nominations.

S. Major pointed out that Acadia to date had not had a 3M Teaching Award, and that most 3M awards in the region were won by recipients of the AAU Teaching Awards.

S. Major stated that B. Robertson and P. Williams had previously won a AAU Teaching Awards. S. Major noted that one of the criteria for these awards was that the nominee had previously won an institutional teaching award. S. Major noted that Acadia no longer had institutional teaching awards. The Associated Alumni teaching awards had not been given for the last several years. The Faculty Development Committee could be working on this area.

The Chair noted that despite multiple attempts over the last two years to get a report from the Faculty Development Committee, no Chair had been elected and no report was forthcoming.

D. Benoit stated that since a distinguished teaching record was needed when faculty were being considered for promotion to full professor, it was important that Acadia put a mechanism in place for faculty to be nominated for institutional teaching awards. This would in turn allow faculty to be considered for AAU teaching awards.

D. Benoit also noted that if faculty members on the Faculty Development Committee were not doing anything, it would be preferable for them to step down.

The Chair stated that there was no mechanism in place to remove people from committees.

M. Rios stated that the ASU would support any initiative to provide

institutional teaching awards and pointed out that the ASU gave out teaching awards annually.

M. Rios noted that he had met with T. Herman to discuss ways in which to maintain a focus on innovation around pedagogy. M. Rios noted that it was necessary to find ways to meet the needs of students: one of the key ways being in the area of innovation and pedagogy.

P. Williams stated that the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science Council decided upon Faculty of Science teaching awards recently, and that the VP Academic Office was also working with the Associated Alumni to revivify the AAAU Teaching Awards.

T. Herman echoed that comment and agreed that these awards were important to the success in regional awards.

G. Whitehall asked for other examples of faculty development from other institutions that Senate could consider.

S. Major stated that Dalhousie offered a one day teaching conference and that various workshops were also offered.

L. Aylward pointed out that the School of Education was in the business of teaching and learning so that they would be keen to be part of any conversation of this nature.

A. Quema suggested creating goals and objectives for the various committees. A. Quema also reminded Senate of the President's Award for Innovation that used to exist but had not been offered for several years.

**Motion that Senate direct the Faculty Development committee to report to Senate on teaching awards currently available on campus and explore various models for teaching support and development at other institutions. Moved by P. Williams, seconded D. Benoit.**

S. Major suggested that the wording be changed to "...other AAAU institutions ...".

There were no objections.

D. Benoit suggested a date to report back be added.

D. MacKinnon felt that what was being asked on campus was too narrow when compared to the information being asked for at other institutions. D. MacKinnon felt that the on-campus portion of the motion should encompass a broader category of support for teaching in addition to awards.

**Amendment to the motion to add a March deadline to report back to Senate. Moved by S. Major, seconded by D. Benoit.**

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

**Amendment to the motion to read "...other practises for teaching support and development on campus...". Moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by S. Major.**

AMENDMENT APPROVED.

**Motion that Senate direct the Faculty Development committee to report by the March meeting of Senate on teaching awards and other practises for teaching support and development on campus and explore models for teaching support and development at other AAU institutions.**

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

MOTION APPROVED AS AMENDED.

6) New Business

- a) Report from the SPAC The Chair noted that the only member of the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee present was S. Bethune.

P. Williams asked whether any tracking of the Scholarship students continued once they were in their courses.

S. Bethune stated that the committee does keep track of the success rate and that the numbers were high.

J. Hooper was a past member of the committee and commented that a certain amount of tracking took place. Concerns about high school grade inflation existed. Schools used to rank their students, but that was no longer done.

A. Quema noted that the work in Arts and Science was very different and stated that it would be difficult for a student to achieve a 95 average in university Arts subjects. It would be informative to know how the scholarships were distributed by Faculty.

The Chair noted that the scholarships were awarded based on high school grades.

S. Bethune stated that students applying for Science were tending to come in with higher grades, but that a certain number of scholarships were ensured for Arts students and that the numbers were balanced between the Faculties. Conditions of renewability have been altered and in a student's first year they are only expected to maintain a university average of 80%, rising to 85% in the second year.

M. Rios noted that these questions have been asked in the Student Advisory Committee meetings and that the information existed. It was expected that the ASU would be meeting with J. Noel Walsh in January to discuss this issue.

The Chair also suggested that Senate could invite J. Noel Walsh to attend a meeting and give a presentation, if they wished to hear more detailed information about scholarship issues.

- b) Request for Input on S. Henderson took the Chair.

## Constitutional Changes

D. Holmberg explained that she wished to make minor changes to the Constitution in places where there was conflicting information. While changes were being made anyway, there were some other suggestions for change that had been made to her in recent years, and could potentially be incorporated. The Chair was looking for input from Senators on the advisability of incorporating these changes. Based on their input, D. Holmberg would bring a motion to Senate for their approval. The following suggestions had been made:

- Allow committees to set their own meeting modality. This arose because Robert's Rules only allow for face to face meetings, but e-mail and Skype or similar are already being used on occasion. It had also been suggested that there should be a minimum number of face to face meetings per year, including one at the beginning and one at the end. This would allow a committee to meet and select a Chair, look at their mandate; and at the end of the year they could agree on what to report back to Senate. This change would be made in the By-laws.
- Ask committees to set out a plan at the beginning of the year and then report on their progress towards those goals at the end of the year. D. Holmberg noted that the Board committees operate in this way. Also, the fact that some tasks might require committees to coordinate with one another made it all the more important for each committee to know what the others were working on.
- In the case of non-functional committees there could be some sort of mechanism to remove committee members if they were not attending or contributing. D. Holmberg noted that there was already a mechanism for removing Senators that missed three consecutive meetings and that theoretically a similar approach could be enforced, but also recognised that this wouldn't work in the case of committee members attending sporadically, or not contributing when they did attend.

B. Latta felt on the second point that it would be useful to Senate to see what a committee planned to work on through the year, so that feedback could be provided.

D. Benoit felt that a deadline for a committee to meet and select a Chair at the start of the year would be useful, and that there should be a mechanism for removing people from the committee, including the Chair if he/she never called a meeting. D. Benoit also felt that it would be very useful to have direction from the previous year's committee on what they had been working on, and what they planned to continue working on. This would also assist new members of the committee each year, providing more continuity.

L. Aylward favoured face to face meetings instead of e-mail communication, especially at the beginning and end of the year. Requesting that committees outline their plans for the year would result in Senate committees becoming more productive. If committee members could be encouraged to step down from committees if they were not contributing through dialogue, this would be preferable to a formal removal mechanism.

S. Bethune noted that not all committees had the same meeting schedule /cycle through the year as others, and that variability would have to be taken

into account if setting any reporting deadlines.

B. Anderson supported having language in the Constitution and felt that if Senate committees were expected to outline their plans for the year to Senate and report on progress at the end of the year, this would be valuable. B. Anderson also felt that a mechanism needed to be in place to encourage a dialogue with committee members that no longer wished to remain on a committee.

P. Doerr asked who would oversee the various committees if these changes were made to the Constitution.

D. Holmberg responded that there was an expectation that there will be less Senate committees in the future. D. Holmberg was also planning to complete a manual for future Senate Chairs to let them know what their duties would be. Those duties could include asking sub-committee chairs for these reports.

J. Whidden felt that concise and clear by-laws concerning the function of committees and their responsibilities would make it easier for committee members to determine whether they were able to contribute effectively or not.

G. Whitehall recognised that Senate was transitioning to a more effective body and felt that there was a need to empower individuals to embrace responsibilities on Senate committees. G. Whitehall pointed out that with fewer faculty members there had resulted in an increase in the committee work load, and he felt that it was necessary to find a way to make committee work seem very valued and that some enumeration should be considered. The increased professionalism of Senate should make participation in committee work more valuable and rewarding.

G. Whitehall believed that Senate committees should be making recommendations and that during the following year new committee members should be continuing to move the recommendations forward – both to Senate and to other bodies on the University campus, so that faculty members' work and time was not wasted. G. Whitehall pointed out that if work just died then it became harder to get faculty members to join committees.

P. Williams asked whether ex-officio members of a committee could be removed from committees.

D. Holmberg noted that there was no mechanism to do that.

H. Wylie noted that for each committee to report on their objectives for the coming year would translate into a considerable amount of Senate business. The number of Senate committees that currently existed would result in a couple of extra Senate meetings in any given year. Various committees had a work load that was both predictable and fairly standard, but other committees could be asked to reflect on their duties for the forthcoming year if their work was of a more free-ranging nature.

A. Quema agreed with G. Whitehall's points and noted that faculty members were overworked. A. Quema asked whether there was a pattern of absenteeism or not on Senate committees. A. Quema also wondered whether Senate had held this sort of discussion at some point in the past. A. Quema noted that in the past members of the Nominating committee approached people that they felt would be good on a particular Senate committee, but that



a discussion at Senate led to a decision that the Nominating committee should not be seeking individuals to serve on particular committees. This process had now created an imbalance and a data base of proven contributions to committee work had now been lost.

D. Holmberg did not feel that there had been previous discussions of restructuring Senate committees as a whole, but noted that there had been four or five attempts to remove the Faculty Development committee, all of which had failed, because the argument “but there is important work there that needs to be done” would invariably surface.

D. Holmberg noted that the Senate records did show that a number of committees were meeting very infrequently or not at all.

D. Benoit stated that there was a difference between committee members not attending meetings, and an entire committee that had become non-functional, such as the Faculty Development committee. D. Benoit felt that this was putting faculty members at a disadvantage in that they were not being considered for AAU awards or 3M awards.

D. Benoit pointed out that if the Curriculum committee did not meet for three years, Senate would need to act upon it.

A. Quema noted the irony of the discussion, in that Senators were discussing the lack of functioning of committees, many of which they themselves sat on.

S. Major stated that the purpose of the Faculty Development committee was primarily to catalogue resources that were currently available at Acadia, so that there really wasn't a lot for the committee to do at present, given that there are few resources.

J. Guiney Yallop was pleased that Senate was trying to find an effective way for Senate to continue its work, and was supportive of the motion because it would enable the committees to continue with their work more effectively.

R. Worvill suggested that committees summarize their recommendations for the coming year in 500 words or less and that these be submitted to Senate.

C. Rushton drew attention to the fact that when a call came for membership on a Senate committee, she was often not aware of the mandate of the committee. This led to situations where she might join a committee and find it to be a bad fit, or stand back from a committee that would have suited her well. C. Rushton felt that faculty were looking for places to fulfill their service requirement, but did not know where to find information on the mandate of each committee.

D. Holmberg stated that the Senate website included the mandate of all of the committees. D. Holmberg suggested that the Faculty Nominating Officers could detail the mandates of the committees when calling for nominations.

H. Wylie noted that if a committee was disbanded, this did not mean that the principle or the work would vanish. This was being discussed by the By-laws committee, in terms of ways of ensuring important work still got done, without assuming that every issue necessarily requires a Senate Standing Committee be established.

V. Zamlyunny was in favour of the first two items in the motion.

J. Wood noted that one of the mandates of every committee was the election of a Chair, and stated that until this happened it was hard for a committee to do anything.

G. Whitehall asked that the reorganisation of the structure of Senate committees be allowed a chance to work before Senate approve item three of the motion. G. Whitehall requested that the Registrar's Office produce a 'family friendly' meeting time. Many people were serving on multiple committees and could not be available for all of them.

A. Smith agreed that if committees could become invigorated and if it became clear that committees were busy and active, item number three would probably solve itself.

P. Williams noted that although Senate did make a change and asked the Nominating committee to call for nominations, Senate did not preclude the Nominating committee from approaching faculty individually.

P. Williams agreed that this was an attempt to facilitate the work of Senate and the work of the Institution. President Ivany had stated earlier that the role of the Senate was described in the university's founding legislation and Acadia could not succeed without Senate performing at a high level.

D. Holmberg responded that she would incorporate items one and two into new language and take it first to the Senate Executive committee, who were meeting with the By-laws committee later in January, and then to Senate for approval. Item three would not be pursued at this time, to see if items one and two solved the problem.

D. Holmberg resumed the Chair.

The Chair noted that 6)c) Adding Library Representation to the APC was a notice of motion only and did not need to be discussed at this meeting.

Likewise, 6)d) Affirmation of Senate membership was a notice of motion only.

P. Williams asked for comments on the motion to add a Library representative to the APC.

A. Smith responded that there was no Library representative on the committee at present. A. Smith noted that in matters such as hiring it would be important to have a Librarian on the APC on occasions when there were matters being discussed that were relevant to the Library.

The Chair noted that there was precedent for that sort of approach, stating that H. Gardner attended Senate Executive only on those occasions when matters relating to the Divinity College were being discussed.

Motion to adjourn at 6:00 p.m., moved by D. Shea.

---

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

## ACADIA UNIVERSITY

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

REPORT DATE: November 13, 2013

SPAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Membership	July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013	July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014
Arts	Stephen Ahern	Xiaoting Wang (Stephen Ahern on sabbatical)
	Thomas Voss replacing Anna Saroli from July 1 to December 31, 2012 Anna Saroli returned January 1, 2013	Diemo Landgraf
	Emma Cochrane (Student Rep)	Stephanie Bethune (Student Rep)
Professional Studies	Scott Landry	Scott Landry
	Igor Semenenko	Igor Semenenko
	Darcy Shea (Student Rep)	Hector Rode Arreola (Student Rep)
Pure & Applied Science	Bryan van der Ende	Jennie Rand
	Richard Karsten (Committee Chair)	Richard Karsten (Committee Chair)
	Alexandra Rice (Student Rep)	Brett Ells (Student Rep)
Registrar or Delegate	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager, Scholarships and Financial Assistance	Judy Noel Walsh, Manager, Scholarships and Financial Assistance
Financial Aid Counselor	Pamela D'Entremont (Committee Secretary)	Pamela D'Entremont (Committee Secretary)

PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

1. To decide policy and process by which winners of scholarships, prizes, bursaries and awards are to be selected and to gather all information it considers necessary for the selection;
2. To select the winners of all undergraduate scholarships, prizes and awards;
3. To periodically investigate the scholarships, prizes and awards program and to recommend improvements (increased funds, new scholarships, more prizes, etc.) to those involved in the program;
4. To promote interest in the scholarship program by posters, letters and other means;
5. To consider such other matters as the Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

MEETINGS DATES

Committee meetings were held during 2012-2013 on the following dates:

July 5, 2012

November 2, 2012

March 27, 2013

May 2, 2013

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

The Bursary & Loan Committee of SPAC met weekly throughout the academic year. Acadia's needs based bursary program assisted 142 students in the 2012-2013 academic year with a budget of \$300,000.

AGENDAS, DISCUSSIONS and CONCLUSIONS

The following represents the main agenda topics:

### 1. Entrance Scholarship Offers

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

- Three Chancellor's Scholarships each valued at \$10,000 renewable
- Four Board of Governor's Scholarships each valued at \$8,000 renewable
- Four President's Scholarships each valued at \$7,000 renewable
- Four International Baccalaureate Scholarships each valued at \$6,500 renewable
- Eight Scholarships for AVRSB students each valued at \$4,000 renewable

### 2. Awarding of 2013 Entrance Scholarships

Acadia offered entrance scholarships to 1077 prospective incoming students for September 2013. This included renewable entrance scholarship offers to all incoming students (in their first undergraduate degree) with an average above 80%. The acceptance rate for 2013 was 44% with 472 accepting their entrance scholarships (approximately \$1.4 M).

### 3. Entrance Scholarship Application Process

The Committee reviewed the use of the information collected on the scholarship information form, endorsement forms and accompanying letters. Minor changes were made to the scholarship information form. The endorsement form was revised to collect the requested information on the form without the need for an accompanying letter. For the 2014-2015 recruitment cycle an online electronic form will be used. As a student's admission file contains their transcript, it was decided a copy is no longer needed on the scholarship file except for transfer students. Committee files will be for the most part electronic for 2014-2015.

### 4. Entrance Scholarship Deferral Policy

Policy wording was approved for use when students who have been offered an entrance scholarship are deferring their admission offer. Scholarship recipients may defer their scholarship offer for a maximum of 12 months, provided they do not enroll in another post-secondary institution during that year.

### 5. Academic Requirements for Grade Based Entrance Scholarships:

For 2012-2013 the entrance scholarship program criteria did not change from the previous year.

The scholarship average grid for 2012-2013

Tier	Gr 11 avg	Gr 12 avg	Renewable Scholarship Value
1	90	95+	2500
2	90	90 – 94.9	1750
3	85	85 – 89.9	1250
4	80	80 – 84.9	650

Students entering with a scholarship average of 90 – 94.9% will also receive a \$1000 non-renewable BMO Financial Group Entrance Scholarship for the 2012-2013 academic year.

The 2013-2014 scholarship program was approved using a combined average – a weighted average using grade 11 and grade 12 - to calculate a scholarship average instead of using both a grade 11 average calculation and a grade 12 average calculation.

The scholarship average grid for 2013-2014

Scholarship Average	Renewable Scholarship Value
95+	\$2500
90 – 94.9	\$1750
85 – 89.9	\$1250
80 – 84.9	\$ 650

Students entering with a scholarship average of 90 – 94.9% will also receive a \$1000 non-renewable BMO Financial Group Entrance Scholarship for the 2013-2014 academic year.

6. Conditions of Renewability

The Conditions of Renewability were updated to include a GPA benchmark in addition to the numeric average as students do not currently have access to numeric marks. The conditions now read “Maintain a minimum average of 80 percent (or sessional GPA of 3.50) in year one and 85 percent (or sessional GPA of 3.67 or Dean’s List standing) in year two and subsequent years.”

7. Scholarship Course Load Conditions

Students holding Acadia scholarships, awards etc are required to be in a full course load unless they have approval from their Faculty Dean/Director for a reduced course load provided the student is still full time. To streamline these process, the need for the approval of their Faculty Dean/Director is now required only for students in less than 27 hours provided the student is still full time.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont  
Secretary

Richard Karsten  
Chair

### **Request for Input from Senate Chair**

I am making minor changes to the Senate Constitution; however, there have been a few other possible changes that have been suggested to me in the past. If Senate believes these are good ideas in principle, I will draft up language to incorporate them; they will still be vetted by the By-laws Committee, voted on with proper notice of motion, etc. If Senate does not approve of these ideas in principle, I won't bother and will leave them out.

1. Allow committees to set their own meeting modalities?
  - a. Should there be a minimum number of face-to-face meetings per year (maybe at least one at beginning, one at end)?
  
2. Have committees outline plans for the year to Senate at the beginning of the year, then report on progress at the end of the year in their annual report? (may help to get things done, increase accountability, help with inter-committee co-operation...)
  
3. Should there be a mechanism for removing members from committees? If so, what?