



Minutes of the Senate meeting of Tuesday 15 October, 2013

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Tuesday 15 October 2013 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Diane Holmberg presiding and 40 present and 1 guest.

- 1) Approval of Agenda Before the motion to approve the agenda was moved, the Chair asked that numbering of 5)b) and 5)c) be corrected to show 5)a) and 5)b).

Motion to approve the agenda as revised. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by B. Perrins.

MOTION CARRIED.

- 2) Minutes of the Meeting of **Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 9th September, 2013 as distributed. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by A. Smith.**
9th September, 2013

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES CARRIED.

- 3) **Announcements**
 a) From the Chair of Senate

Regrets were received from D. Seamone, G. Phillips, J. MacLeod and C. Stanley.

The Chair also noted that due to the change of day and teaching schedules, a number of faculty members would arrive late.

The Chair welcomed L. Davidson as a guest.

The Chair welcomed and noted that R. Worvill would be the Faculty of Arts replacement for P. Hobson. The Chair also welcomed Kaycee Morrison, the new graduate student representative to Senate.

The Chair reported that Senate Executive met at the end of September and decided that committees working on the priority goals of Senate for any given year would report on alternative months, and that this month would be the By-laws committee and the Graduate Studies Committee. Next month would be the TIE committee and the Curriculum Committee, and possibly the Academic Planning Committee. The Chair noted that the committees would decide which form of report they would provide – verbal or written – and that this would be a good opportunity for Senators to ask questions and provide feedback.

The Chair stated that Senate Executive had discussed the possibility of more than two opportunities in a year for graduates to receive their diploma, but that this would come up later in the meeting.

The Chair also drew attention to various contradictions in the By-laws that

needed to be corrected. The Chair also will prepare something for the By-laws to describe different methods of meeting, since Robert's Rules only allow for face to face meetings, unless specified in the By-laws.

The Chair noted that Senate Executive had discussed the transition to numeric grades on student transcripts and stated that this issue will come forward to Senate in the future.

The Chair noted that the Budget Advisory committee had yet to meet.

The Chair was expecting to meet with P. Jewer, Chair of the Board of Governors in the near future to discuss issues surrounding the Senate and Board membership lists, and also the intention for the ARC to meet with the APC.

b) From the President

President Ivany stated that the impact the Professional Association of Foreign Service Officers (PAFSO) strike had on international student enrolment this year was now clearer and that staff estimated that approximately 40 international students had gone elsewhere. President Ivany noted that Acadia was unable to interview students that had not arrived so the student number represented a best estimate.

President Ivany reported that the AAU preliminary enrolment data had been shared with Acadia faculty last week, and that the data was now available on the AAU website. Acadia's increase of 3.7% overall was again the highest in Atlantic Canada. President Ivany noted that more institutions were experiencing negative growth in enrolment, and there was also a softening on the international student side of enrolment.

President Ivany qualified this by stating that the incoming class was no larger this year, but that the growth was a direct result of the larger cohorts moving through. Projections for the future indicated a flattening of enrolment levels at approximately 3600 students.

President Ivany noted the recent election results and pointed out that there were elements in the Liberal campaign that were of interest to Acadia. The first was that the Liberals had indicated they intended to negotiate a new Memorandum of Understanding with the university sector prior to the expiration of the existing one. Secondly, there was an announcement that Nova Scotia would provide additional graduate scholarships, in addition to some forgiveness of interest on student loans.

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

T. Herman reminded Senators of the U4 initiative for October 20th and 21st, 2013. This would be a symposium on undergraduate research and entitled *Undergraduate Research: Power and Possibility*. This event will involve the four U4 universities and eleven teams in total and will center on presentations from faculty/student research pairs from each university. Faculty were encouraged to attend both the Sunday and Monday morning sessions.

4) Time sensitive items

a) Approval of Graduates

- i) Approval of list
(*circulated*)

Motion to approve the list of graduates for the Convocation of October 15th, 2013. Moved by B. Perrins, seconded by R. Murphy.

MOTION CARRIED.

- ii) Enabling Motion
(*attached; note changes with rationale*)

The Chair stated that the enabling motion would now be read, but noted that changes had been made to the motion to work around the problems that students experienced when they were unable to get their diploma until the next Convocation, even though they were required by their prospective employer to present it. This would be a temporary measure while the Registrar looked into all aspects of the possible change, which would come back to Senate in the form of a set of recommendations and motions for approval. Students particularly affected by this were those in the 16 month B.Ed. program, because they completed their studies in August of any given year.

The Chair stated that this issue had been discussed at Senate Executive and that one student was in this situation during the summer, and another was now working in Thailand and facing expulsion unless they were able to produce their diploma. Students were able to get a letter from the Registrar's Office stating that they had fulfilled the requirements for their degree, and in many cases this was considered sufficient, but in the rare case an actual diploma was required.

The Chair reported that Senate Executive felt that moving to three Convocations in a year would be a good thing, but also noted that this would create some issues which will need to be worked out.

The Chair explained that by changing the wording of the enabling motion, it should be possible to work around this problem and enable the sub-committee to meet and grant the diploma any time between October and April 2014, always ensuring that the granting of any diploma was reported to Senate at the following Senate meeting.

Senators were asked if they had any questions. There were none.

T. Herman read the newly worded enabling motion. Moved by T. Herman, seconded by E. Callaghan.

D. Benoit asked how a determination would be made as to whether a student really needed their diploma, or whether they just wanted it early.

D. Serafini stated that the request would come to him and that he would research it thoroughly, but that if the student was accepting employment internationally there was every likelihood that they would need their diploma.

D. Benoit asked whether the Registrar would be deciding whether the committee would consider each request.

The Chair felt that a request could come to any of the members on the sub-committee, but that they would be likely to defer to the Registrar for a final decision.

D. Benoit wanted to know whether every request for a diploma would have to be decided by the sub-committee, or would one person review all requests.

T. Herman stated that the Registrar would be the person to initially receive the request and to be the person that provided the initial filter.

The Chair requested that the minutes reflect that if there were questions from individual departments or students, they should be referred to the Registrar. The Registrar would serve as an initial screening person to review all requests, consulting with other members of the sub-committee if needed.

D. Benoit agreed with this approach.

President Ivany suggested that periodically or at the end of the described time period, Senate could receive a report that indicated the number of requests in total, with further breakdown indicating the number of requests that were vetted and granted, and the number that were not granted.

The Chair agreed.

MOTION CARRIED.

5) Priority Items

a) Report from By-laws committee on sub-committee restructuring

The Chair noted that these 'priority items' will appear on the agenda immediately after 'time-sensitive' items throughout the year. This will present opportunity for feedback and questions from other Senators on these priority issues.

B. Anderson reported that only 10 of the 24 sub-committees provided feedback on the survey that was sent out, and that it was therefore difficult to bring forward an overarching set of recommendations with a less than 50% response rate. Those sub-committee members that did respond all felt the work of their committee to be extremely important and believed that the membership should not be altered.

B. Anderson stated that the By-laws committee recognized that reform needs to occur, by looking at the overarching mandate of Senate; looking at the sub-committees; and then determining which ones would help to advance the mandate of Senate.

B. Anderson reported that H. Kitchen, the Chair of the By-laws committee, had resigned, which left the committee devoid of a Faculty of Arts representative at present; but that she had committed to writing a report on behalf of the By-laws committee to be brought to the November Senate meeting. B. Anderson stated that the report would be vetted by all members of the By-laws committee.

The Chair offered to discuss the roles of the various sub-committees and what the tasks were that they needed to be doing, during a Senate meeting, if that would be helpful to the By-laws Committee. The Chair also noted that Senate Executive had discussed a scenario whereby the best approach might be imagining a new Senate was being created, and creating a set of sub-committees to fulfill its mandate from scratch, rather than trying to change existing committees in small ways.

A. Quema asked whether comparisons could be drawn with institutions of similar size to see how many committees they had and how tasks were

allocated. A. Quema felt that each sub-committee had important mandates but recognised also that there were fewer faculty members to populate them.

B. Anderson agreed but did feel that it was important to look at what the mandate of Acadia's Senate was and ensure that the various committees aligned with that. B. Anderson noted that in the report that did look at other Senates across the country, there were obvious differences in the way that decision-making was carried out.

President Ivany asked whether the U4 counterparts might be useful subsets as their size and educational mandate was similar to Acadia.

b) Report from Senate
Research Committee on
Strategic Research Plan

D. MacKinnon explained that he was looking for advice from Senators. Last year, the Research Committee put together a process for reviewing the Strategic Research Plan (SRP) and stated that there were two key elements: to design a process that was transparent and to design a process that involved the campus community. D. MacKinnon noted that he had met with all of the Heads and Directors individually, as well as all of the co-ordinators of inter-disciplinary programs. The second part of the process involved soliciting responses to a set of questions that were distributed to all units. D. MacKinnon stated that responses and feedback have only been received from five units to date. Feedback that had been received included one unit stating that since they valued all research that went on in their unit, they would not respond at all to the survey. Some other units felt that D. MacKinnon and the Research committee should proceed without their feedback.

D. MacKinnon asked Senators whether he should request feedback once again from the departments, or try a different approach.

E. Callaghan suggested going back to Heads and Directors and asking one more time, but also stating that in the absence of feedback from them, D. MacKinnon would be proceeding without their input, at the same time explaining to them the way in which he would be proceeding.

A. Quema reminded D. MacKinnon that she had expected resistance to the process. A. Quema did not feel that proceeding without feedback would solve any problems or help the situation. A. Quema felt that a discussion was needed to see what the problems were and how to solve them.

D. MacKinnon responded that if the process had gone well, the next step would have been for each Faculty to put together a focus group to talk about the themes that were emerging. D. MacKinnon felt that another approach would be for Research & Graduate Studies to go back through every application for research funding that had come to them through the last several years and ask the Research committee to carry out an analysis of this information, to determine the various strengths and themes that appeared through such an analysis. These themes could then serve as a starting point for the focus group discussions.

The Chair asked for further comments.

President Ivany did not feel that standing still was an effective approach, noting that Acadia had been one of the strongest voices nationally with the granting councils, around the fact that smaller universities do not do as well as the larger research universities in certain categories. It was felt that smaller

universities do not do a good job at laying out a research plan that clearly identifies areas of strength and focus. President Ivany noted that there was a lot at stake.

E. Callaghan felt that looking back over the last several years would be a useful exercise, but also wondered whether making phone calls to each unit that had not responded might work.

A. Quema felt that the problem was political in nature. A. Quema felt that there was political resistance to an approach to research that was perceived to be dictating what the fields of research should be on the campus, and a process that dictated how research grants should be distributed. A. Quema encouraged other Senators to speak up if they felt differently.

D. MacKinnon recognised that there would be resistance and agreed that this was a political process. Having gone back to the Heads, Directors and Deans twice, D. MacKinnon was worried about pushing things too far and felt that at some point a process needed to be agreed upon. D. MacKinnon had expected that a process would have been determined by now.

D. Benoit suggested carrying out the thematic analysis first and sending it to each unit to see what response they then provided. This would allow a department to identify the type of research that they wished to do in the future, if it was in a different subject area from in the past.

D. MacKinnon agreed with this approach, and planned to proceed in such a fashion. There were no objections.

L. Aylward thanked A. Quema for her earlier comments, and agreed that it was difficult, and perhaps not always desirable, to weigh the relative strengths of various research programs.

6) New Business

a) VPA Report on Budget 2013-14

The Chair noted that the document had been circulated and reminded Senate that it had been decided several years ago that in the Spring the VP Academic would provide the budget actuals, and that in the Fall the budget projections would be provided.

T. Herman commented that the allocations for 25.54 and 25.56 had been split out by individual units for the individual Faculties and that the Academic General budget had also been broken down to show how that money was spent. T. Herman stated that much of the Academic General budget was used to cover indirect costs of research. T. Herman also noted that under the heading of 'miscellaneous' was the portion from the VP Academic's office that covered costs pertaining to inter-disciplinary programming.

T. Herman stated that there were modest increases in the budgets of all three Faculties compared to the 2012-13 budgets, and the cost of 8.5 additional CLT's and additional Instructors were reflected in these increased figures. These increases addressed the most pressing demands across the Faculties.

S. Bethune asked what a CLT was and what 25.54 and 25.56 covered. T. Herman explained that a CLT stood for a Contractually Limited Term faculty appointment and noted that this could be for a one, two or three year term.

The Chair noted that these were full-time, but not tenure track, positions.

T. Herman noted that 25.54 and 25.56 covered professional development funding for full-time and part-time faculty members.

The Chair explained that these numbers referred to article numbers in the 13th Collective Agreement.

- b) Guidelines for Faculty from the Curriculum Committee
(*attached*)

Motion that Senate approve the attached Guidelines for Faculty from the Senate Curriculum Committee. Moved by A. Quema, seconded by R. Worvill.

A. Quema explained that this was a document that had been created to take faculty members and units through the various steps involved in creating curriculum revisions and changes. The guidelines described the current process and A. Quema asked R. Worvill to speak to the document. A. Quema also noted that the Curriculum committee wanted to spend more time considering larger curriculum issues in future.

R. Worvill stated that she recently re-joined the Curriculum committee and had found that the committee as a whole was spending time on aspects of the process that would in the past have been completed at the unit level, and that the chair of the Curriculum committee was spending time meeting with individual departments to get the forms corrected.

R. Worvill noted that the process to be followed was embedded in the forms and that when units started completing the forms at too late a stage in the term, it became impossible for them to cover all of the questions. It was felt that the guidelines would help units to complete the submission in the right order.

R. Worvill explained that there were two parts to the guidelines: one for individuals and one for Faculty Curriculum committees.

I. Hutchinson asked whether the committee had considered offering the curriculum process twice a year, instead of once only. I. Hutchinson felt that the fall deadline was a difficult one to meet. Ian gave an example of the professional accounting designations in Canada, that were merging from three down to one, which resulted in differing competencies being expected to be achieved in university programs. I. Hutchinson noted that if the Business program wanted to have students achieve these competencies, extensive curriculum revision would be required. As the School only received word of the changes recently, they would not be able to have a proposal ready before February. I. Hutchinson felt that other units might also experience occasions when they would appreciate being able to bring forward curriculum changes in February.

A. Quema suggested that the Registrar speak to I. Hutchinson and she recognised that some programs had professional designations while others didn't. A. Quema noted that the reason for the early deadline was because students needed to register in March, and as a result, Senate needed to approve curriculum changes by February.

I. Hutchinson felt that the timetable that was issued in February often saw minor changes through the following months and felt that if curriculum changes were small they could be brought forward in February. I. Hutchinson

felt that the additional flexibility would be a good thing.

D. Benoit asked whether the printed version or the on-line version of the calendar was the official one.

D. Serafini noted that the two were not always consistent and stated that he had asked his staff to address this issue. D. Serafini indicated that there were a number of issues that the Curriculum committee could discuss in the future, this being one of them.

T. Herman stated that the printed calendar was generally deferred to, but that was an issue that could require a policy to be put in place.

R. Worvill pointed out that student consultation was not always being carried out. If increased flexibility was to be provided to the units, it was important to ensure that this part of the process was carried out.

A. Quema recognised that the forms were not liked, but explained that ten copies of forms were required because the Curriculum committee comprised of 10 members. A. Quema noted that the staff in the Registrar's office need specific information on the curriculum forms and will then type all of the information into the academic calendar. A. Quema stated that if the forms were completed properly at the unit level, the Curriculum committee would not need to pore over them so carefully and keep coming back to the units for additional clarification.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Chair asked where this document would be publicised.

A. Quema noted that now that the document was approved, she would talk to P. Dimock, who could place it on the website.

c) Honours Committee
Annual Report (*Attached*)

D. MacKinnon stated that he did not chair the committee but that P. Ranjan was away at present so he had prepared a report which included a list of all faculty that had offered to serve as an external reader and review a thesis.

J. Hooper appreciated having the list of faculty that had undertaken to do this.

d) APMC Report for the
School of Music

The Chair explained the process and noted that Senate would be approving these recommendations. The Chair would move all of the recommendations as a group if there were no objections.

There were none.

Motion that Senate approve the prioritized recommendations for the School of Music, as attached. Moved by T. Herman, seconded by C. Rushton.

T. Herman thanked the School of Music for their efforts in preparing for the review, and also appreciated the participation and input from the internal and external reviewers. It was pointed out that recommendations had been prioritized by three levels of priority and that they were organized around the

urgency of acting on them, and around the ability to act on them. Hence, a priority #1, level one item would begin as soon as was possible.

T. Herman now detailed the priority level one recommendations in some detail. These included:

- models for shared space in the Festival Theatre and working with the Administration to achieve this
- making additional use of the resources provided by the Office of Research and Graduate Studies
- exploration of the area of course scheduling and timetabling
- Suite of recommendations around curricula reform as the curriculum is congested.

T. Herman addressed the priority level two recommendations in detail:

- Recommendation that a music historian be added to the School and that shared interests between the School of Music and the Department of History could be pursued productively, and collaboration encouraged. The same was felt to be true with the School of Education and the School of Music
- Consideration to engage a Coop student who could help in office management and event promotion, thereby developing a suite of skills that would be valuable to someone in the music field
- Ever-greening of the piano inventory
- Potential creation of a Technical Director position, which would require a joint discussion between the School of Music, Theatre Studies and the Office of Special Events
- Review of approach to part-time employees to address the challenges that currently exist
- The importance of summer music camps and a recommendation that the School of Music allow Open Acadia to handle the marketing of the camps

T. Herman addressed the priority level three recommendations:

- The APRC recommended that the APC explore the current teaching categories to decide whether they are appropriate to the School's present needs or future needs
- Review of custodial services support because of the maintenance needs around the program.

W. Sights felt that the School of Music was doing a good job with small resources and felt that the department might feel frustrated that some of the things that were being requested, were being pushed aside. W. Sights felt that any conversation with the History department would be a short one because it was unlikely that there was anyone on the History department with the necessary expertise to serve as a music historian.

W. Sights felt that in order for the School of Music to get closer to academic research activities it would be essential for them to have a music historian.

C. Rushton thanked the APRC for their thorough report and noted that the School had already begun an extensive curriculum reform. These reforms will be resolved later in the year. C. Rushton noted that the current part-time

hiring process negatively impacts the School of Music program and asked for assistance from Senate to move forward with this.

C. Rushton noted that it was disappointing to the School to see priority #7 and priority # 13 so far down the list, especially to see custodial support at the bottom. Presently, the faculty have to set up hundreds of chairs on a regular basis because of the lack of custodial services.

C. Rushton thanked the APRC and hoped that there was a way to change some of the priorities on the list.

A. Quema noted that curriculum renewal was very common from the School of Music. A. Quema agreed with D. Serafini that the Curriculum committee needed to operate in a different way, by in fact meeting before programs complete all of the curriculum forms to bring forward changes. This would enable the Curriculum committee to offer help and guidance to the units at the beginning stage of the process.

The Chair drew attention to recommendation #10, which stated '*To that end, the APRC recommends that Senate bring to the Board of Governors' attention the unworkable nature of the part-time hiring process and its unintended negative consequences for the Music program*', and asked how that could happen, also noting that it moved into Collective Agreement territory.

T. Herman agreed that this was the case, which was why the APRC recommended that it be brought to the Board of Governors' attention, because the Collective Agreement was an agreement between the BoG and the Faculty Association.

The Chair asked that if something was to be done on Senate's behalf, she would like to know what the APRC had in mind.

T. Herman felt there would just need to be a drawing out of the issues in a letter from the Chair of Senate to the Chair of the Board of Governors, to bring the academic issues to their attention. The Chair agreed to send such a letter.

T. Herman responded to W. Slights' earlier point and clarified the existing text. T. Herman felt that this did not preclude the School of Music hiring a part-time or contract person to teach music history, for example.

MOTION CARRIED.

e) President's Report

The Chair reminded Senate that last year she had noticed a requirement for the President to provide an annual report to Senate and that there had been a tradition of that happening for many years until the early 1990's. President Ivany had agreed to revive this tradition for Senate. The Chair noted that President Ivany already provides a similar report to the University Faculty in the fall, but that that report dwelt more on the financial aspects than this one would.

This report will have a broad overview and will contain information from units that report to the President, and will just be presented for the information of Senate.

President Ivany asked that if Senators had any suggestions they could pass them on to him. President Ivany felt that in order to have some discussion on the report the meeting would run overtime, and asked the Chair how she would like to proceed.

The Chair was open to suggestions from Senate.

W. Slights suggested that since the information was only recently received, it would be a good thing to postpone the item to the next Senate meeting.

There were no objections.

Motion to adjourn at 5:55 p.m., moved by W. Slights.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Enabling Motion

(please note revisions from traditional version, with rationale)

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 April 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.**

Rationale: Inspired by the issue of a student in the summer absolutely requiring his official diploma to begin his job, Senate Executive discussed whether providing more frequent opportunities for students to formally obtain their diplomas was desirable, and feasible. All agreed it would be desirable; however, more work would be required to make it possible. In 99% of cases, students are fine with a letter from the Registrar's Office indicating they have fulfilled all the requirements to graduate; however, in rare instances, employers or other bodies absolutely insist on the formal diploma. By extending the enabling motion to apply across the year, Senate would empower the VPA, Dean, Head/Director, and Registrar to issue the diploma in Senate's name, if necessary. This group would still have to report their decisions to Senate, allowing the full Senate to maintain final oversight of the process. Note we would expect this enabling motion to be used only very rarely; in the vast majority of cases, students will continue with the current system of receiving a letter indicating they have fulfilled their requirements, but will not receive their official diploma until May 2014. Meanwhile, the Registrar will begin exploring the possibility of moving to more frequent opportunities to receive the diploma, perhaps beginning with three opportunities per year. Any plan to do so will, of course, be brought to Senate for approval.

Guidelines for Faculty

1. The forms you must use for proposing changes to the curriculum (courses or programmes) are available on the Registrar's Office webpage at the following link:
https://central.acadiau.ca/registrar/faculty_information/Curriculum . In making curriculum changes, please make sure that these changes cohere with the existing degree requirements of your program so as to avoid contradictions and inconsistencies. You are required to submit your curriculum proposals for a vote in your department or school before sending them to the Curriculum Committee of your faculty.
2. The deadline posted on the RO webpage is the date by which all submissions must be received by the Senate Curriculum Committee. The date by which you have to complete the initial preparation of your forms is the date established by your faculty Curriculum Committee. Their date will be chosen in such a way as to allow them to process all the forms submitted by the faculty, arrange for the authors to make any necessary changes and present the finalized forms to a meeting of your faculty council. Your forms will therefore need to be ready to go to your faculty curriculum committee sometime in October. Your faculty curriculum committee should specify its deadline for receiving your material early in the Fall term.
3. The details and complexity of the forms vary according to the changes you want to make, but several of the forms have questions about your consultations with students and your consultations with library staff. This means that you need to start the process of preparing your submission well in advance of your faculty deadline in order to gather the necessary information.
4. Note that course titles must be easily converted to a 'short' course title of no more than 30 characters for university transcripts. If the course title for the calendar entry exceeds this length, you must supply the short, 30 character version for transcript use. This constraint may affect the title that you choose.
5. Course descriptions may not exceed 60 words; this rule exists to ensure that the University calendar does not become too unwieldy or too expensive to produce. Course descriptions should be expressed in clear, grammatically-correct language and avoid jargon or overly-technical language, as far as is reasonably possible. The calendar is accessed by many people for many different reasons. It is the document that informs the public and students about what we teach, so it should be an accessible document and should provide accurate information. Courses that stand little chance of being offered in the foreseeable future should be deleted in order to avoid false advertising or the creation of false expectations for students.
6. Once your proposals have been approved by your faculty curriculum committee and presented to your faculty council, you are responsible for seeing that TEN paper copies (the required number) are sent to the Registrar's Office. The ten copies are then distributed to the ten members of the Senate Curriculum Committee for discussion and analysis. In some departments, the Head or Director or other delegate submits all proposals for the same unit; make sure you know how this is done in your unit and that whoever is responsible for submitting your proposals has the most

recent version of them. The Head or Director or delegate will need an electronic copy of your form(s) for submission to the Registrar's Office, and will include an electronic copy of the minutes of the relevant faculty council meeting and a summary page itemizing all the proposals from your unit.

Guidelines for Faculty Curriculum Committees

1. All the information you will need is available either on the Registrar's office website (https://central.acadiau.ca/registrar/faculty_information/Curriculum) or in the Constitution document of your faculty. You should check both these sources. Familiarize yourself with the forms and the instructions on the Registrar's Office webpage, since your faculty curriculum committee is responsible for ensuring that these forms are properly completed. Your faculty constitution will set out details concerning how curriculum proposals should be presented to your faculty.
2. **NOTE** the date (given on the webpage) by which all curriculum proposals must be forwarded to the University Curriculum committee and **SET** your deadline for receipt of submissions from your faculty. Proposals from your faculty must be presented at a meeting of your faculty council for information or approval, so you will set your date for the receipt of all curriculum proposals in relation to the date of that faculty council meeting so that you will be ready to present the finalized submissions at that time. Allow plenty of time for your committee to do its work; the deadline for the receipt of submissions from your faculty should probably be at least three weeks prior to the date of the November faculty council meeting. Circulate this date to all departments (or all colleagues) as soon as possible in September. In the same message give them the URL for the webpage where they can access the necessary forms.
3. When you receive the submissions from your faculty, the job of your committee is to go through each one ensuring that it has been properly completed. This includes **COUNTING** the number of characters used in the short course title and the number of words in the course description to make sure that these do not exceed the limits of 30 characters and sixty words respectively. However annoying they may seem, these constraints are very important. A viable short title is needed for university transcripts and should give a clear indication of what the course covered. The 60 word limit for course descriptions exists to ensure that the university calendar does not become too unwieldy a document or too expensive to produce. Courses that are no longer offered should be deleted so that the calendar remains an accurate reflection of what is actually taught at Acadia. In addition, make sure that course descriptions are clear and expressed in language that is grammatically correct. If you find that there are problems in any of these areas, it is not your job to make the corrections; you should simply return the forms to the authors and ask them to address the problems you have identified.
4. Two other common problem areas are the questions that arise on some of the forms relating to the canvassing of student opinion and consultation with the library. In the case of changes other than changes to a program as a whole, colleagues sometimes only get around to completing their

curriculum change forms at the last minute and are unaware that they need to do these things. However, canvassing of student opinion and consultation with the library are required elements of the process for a number of curriculum proposals and if these things have not been done, the forms are incomplete and should be returned to the author so that they can be addressed.

5. It is advisable for the faculty curriculum committee to compare the proposed changes they receive from departments with the calendar entries relating to degree requirements in that department to ensure that colleagues have not inadvertently overlooked any of the consequences of their proposed changes. Check that the changes, if initiated, will not result in any contradictions or inconsistencies within the program as a whole. If you come across something that seems unclear or problematic, consult with the department for clarification.
6. Once all the submissions have passed your inspection, prepare a document for presentation to your faculty council using the guidelines in your faculty constitution. Once the proposals have been presented to and, if necessary, approved by your faculty council, send a message to all the colleagues who made submissions instructing them to send 10 printed copies of each of their proposals to the Registrar's Office by the deadline stated on the webpage and one electronic copy to the Head/Director or delegate of the unit. The Head or Director or his/her delegate should send the electronic versions of all proposals, an electronic copy of the Faculty Council minutes dealing with the proposals, and a summary sheet setting out all the curriculum changes for their unit to the Registrar's Office.

Honours Committee
Annual Report for 2012-2013

Committee Members

E. Cochrane, student representative, Faculty of Arts
J. Yang, Faculty of Professional Studies
M. Lukeman, Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
D. MacKinnon, Research & Graduate Studies (*ex officio*)
P. Ranjan, Faculty of Pure & Applied Science (Chair)
R. Seale, Faculty of Arts
C. Shields, Faculty of Professional Studies
S. Thompson, student representative, Faculty of Professional Studies
T. Thomson, Faculty of Arts
B. Webster, student representative, Faculty of Pure & Applied Science

Meeting

The Honours Committee held only one meeting during the 2012-2013 academic year. In that meeting it was announced that the Registrar has formally been named by Senate as an *ex officio* member of the Honours Committee.

D. MacKinnon informed the Committee of discussions in Senate concerning the deadline for submissions of Honours theses. While there will be no changes to this year's deadline (March 15), in the 2013-2014 academic year the deadlines will be as follows: March 31, last day to submit Honours theses for external review; April 21, last day to submit approved Honours theses for spring convocation. The Committee expressed great concern about asking faculty members to serve as reviewers during the examination period.

The Chair reviewed the evaluation process for Honours theses, and requested that Research & Graduate Studies continue with the practice (begun the previous year) of having the Dean identify a reviewer for each thesis based on a cognate connection between the topic area and the reviewer's research activity or interest. While the Committee recognized that this would not be possible in all cases, it nonetheless felt that where the connection existed, it would allow the external reviewer to offer subject conversant comments.

The Chair also continued the conversation begun the previous year on the possible development of a thesis template for students. However, it was determined that such a template was not feasible given the style variation among disciplines.

End of Year

There were 118 Honours theses submitted during the 2012-2013 academic year. These were reviewed by 111 external reviewers. With the approval of the Chair of the Honours Committee, the Dean of RGS prepared a campus thank-you to all reviewers (appended), signed by the Chair, the Dean, the VP Academic, and the President.

Submitted by D. MacKinnon, Dean of Research & Graduate Studies
On behalf of P. Ranjan, (former) Chair of the Senate Honours Committee
October, 2013



A GREAT **BIG** THANK YOU!!

One of the most celebrated aspects of an Acadia undergraduate education is student participation in research. Of all the ways in which this happens, writing an Honours thesis is likely the most visible and rigorous. As part of the thesis process, Senate requires that each manuscript be reviewed by an external reader. External readers are Acadia faculty members outside of students' departments and schools. We know the impact of asking our colleagues to read a thesis at what is probably the most challenging time of year, i.e., a time when faculty members are busiest and trying to cope with end-of-term requirements for their own students. Every single person who reviews an Honours thesis is inundated with demands, and would be forgiven for saying "I'm sorry, I am just too busy." Yet, each year many, many faculty members bury the I'm-too-busy response and voluntarily give of their time to assist students who they likely never taught and probably don't know.

This year, one hundred and eleven (111) of our colleagues did exactly that. Each of them read at least one thesis, and in some cases, two or more. We want to take this opportunity to say a great big THANK YOU to each one of them. They are named on the next page. We hope we haven't missed anyone, and if we have, please accept our deepest apologies. Thank you for the above-and-beyond contribution you have made to the academic experience of our students.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Pritam Ranjan".

Pritam Ranjan
Chair, Honours Committee

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David MacKinnon".

David MacKinnon
Dean, Research and Graduate Studies

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tom Herman".

Tom Herman
Vice President Academic

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ray Ivany".

Ray Ivany
President and Vice Chancellor



Paul Abela
 Stephen Ahern
 Cynthia Alexander
 Paul Arnold
 Shaughney Aston
 Trevor Avery
 Lynn Aylward
 Jeff Banks
 Svetlana Barkanova
 Sandra Barr
 Janice Best
 Andrew Biro
 Glyn Bissix
 Soren Bondrup-Nielsen
 William Brackney
 Edith Callaghan
 Paul Callaghan
 Hugh Chipman
 John Colton
 Michael Dadswell
 Deborah Day
 Michael Dennis
 Jim Diamond
 Paul Doerr
 Shilpa Dogra
 David Duke
 Matt Durant
 Kelly Dye
 Bobby Ellis
 Rodger Evans
 Ian Feltmate
 Scott Follows
 Connie Foote
 Jonathon Fowles
 Lesley Frank
 Glenys Gibson
 John Guiney Yallop

Heather Hemming
 Stephen Henderson
 Kirk Hillier
 Paul Hobson
 Jason Holt
 Diane Holmberg
 Jeff Hooper
 Peter Horvath
 Ian Hutchinson
 Amitabh Jha
 Heather Kitchin
 Dave Kristie
 Darren Kruisselbrink
 Lance La Rocque
 Brian Latta
 Ron Lehr
 Michael Leiter
 Matthew Lukeman
 Shelley MacDougall
 David MacKinnon
 Franklin Mendivil
 Anna Migliarisi
 Andrew Mitchell
 Steve Mockford
 Barry Moody
 Barbara Moore
 Catherine Morley
 Hassouna Moussa
 John Murimboh
 Jianan Peng
 Robert Pitter
 Susan Potter
 Gillian Poulter
 Robert Proulx
 Anne Quema
 Rob Raeside
 Marc Ramsey

Pritam Ranjan
 Anna Redden
 Ed Reekie
 Beth Robinson
 Glynis Ross
 Christianne Rushton
 Donna Sears
 Chris Shields
 Michael Sheppard
 Dave Shutler
 Scott Skjei
 Jessica Slights
 Todd Smith
 Ian Spooner
 Cliff Stanley
 Paul Stephenson
 Igor Semenenko
 Mike Stokesbury
 Doug Symons
 Martin Tango
 Holger Telsmann
 Tony Thomson
 Anthony Tong
 Brenda Trofantenko
 Brian VanBlarcom
 Bryan van der Ende
 Ann Vibert
 Jun Yang
 Yinglei Wang
 Terrance Weatherbee
 Kevin Whetter
 Ian Wilks
 Peter Williams
 Brian Wilson
 Vlad Zamlynnny
 Haiyi Zhang
 Ying Zhang

**Academic Program Review Committee –
Recommendations arising from the Review of the School of Music**

September 30, 2013

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) received the formal response from the School of Music to the External Review Team's report on June 6, 2013. We subsequently met on June 26, 2013 with the School's Director, Dr. Jeff Hennessy, to discuss the School's response to the review. After careful consideration of the review, the response to it from the School, and our discussion with the School's Director, the APRC offers a set of recommendations below. The number in brackets [] refers to the original recommendation number in the External Academic Program Review document.

A copy of the review and the School's response will be made available to Senate. The APRC's recommendations are presented below, organized by level of priority, from highest to lowest:

Priority Level 1

- 1) Reviewers commented extensively on the management, use, and dedication of the Festival Theatre space. Elsewhere, such shared performance spaces have been managed effectively and efficiently (e.g., UBC, U Calgary).

To that end, the APRC recommends that the SOM work with the Administration to explore models for shared space that recognize the distinctive requirements and contributions of academic programs in such spaces. This is particularly timely in light of the recent recommendation from the APRC that the Dean of Arts, the School of Music, and faculty members in Theatre Studies explore the development of a School for Creative Arts. **[11, 12, 13]**

- 2) Reviewers recommended that Faculty in the SOM avail themselves of assistance from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies to help identify internal and external funding opportunities for research.

The APRC encourages them to do so, and is pleased to report that the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies is of like mind. **[14]**

- 3) The APRC recognizes the concern expressed over complicated course scheduling and congested timetabling, and that these often become most apparent when attempting to accommodate or coordinate two programs simultaneously. Although this problem was raised in the context of coordinating two specific programs, this appears to be a wider problem and probably requires attention system-wide.

To that end, the APRC requests that the TIE Committee explore the extent of the problem and offer appropriate recommendations/reforms to address the issue. **[4]**

- 4) Reviewers made a suite of recommendations regarding program advising and curricular reform. Advising issues arise in part from a "congested curriculum" and late allocation of part-time teaching assignments.

The APRC heartily endorses the committee's call for curricular renewal, which will not only increase flexibility for our students but will also help differentiate our program from others regionally and nationally.

Additionally we applaud the School's efforts to create a program "within the context of a Liberal Arts university", which is "more of a laboratory than a conservatory".

To that end, we urge the School to pursue this renewal, with the aid of the Senate Curriculum Committee and the Dean of Arts, as soon as possible. **[15, 16, 17, 18]**

Priority Level 2

- 5) The APRC recognizes the absence of a Music historian in the School at present, while also recognizing the present pressures on scarce tenure-stream resources.

To that end, the APRC recommends that the SOM and the Department of History and Classics explore opportunities for potential collaboration in offering courses of mutual interest. **[5]**

- 6) Reviewers recommended that the SOM engage with the School of Education (SOE) to explore a shared position with expertise in music education. Although present enrolment challenges in education programs preclude creation of additional positions at this time, they do not preclude exploring greater coordination of existing resources.

To that end, the APRC encourages conversations between the SOM and the SOE. **[20]**

- 7) The APRC recognizes that the School of Music (SOM) has been well served by its existing administrative manager, but that the unit has a significant need for administrative support to assist in scheduling auditions, hiring the large number of part-time and applied music instructors, and course registration in a complex and unconventional timetable. We also recognize the responsibilities associated with the heavy external/community commitments of the unit.

The present practice of combining general secretarial and specific Director support appears to be a source of stress. This circumstance is not unique to the SOM but may be more acute than elsewhere.

To that end, as the APRC recognizes that there is little likelihood of hiring additional permanent support staff in the near future, we recommend that the unit explore utilizing co-op students (as has been successfully done in JSOCS) to perform some of those duties, while simultaneously providing our students with valuable work experience.

Further, we encourage a campus-wide review of administrative assistant resource allocations, and of processes that generate undue administrative burden. **[1]**

- 8) The maintenance and evergreening of the piano inventory are a challenge in all music programs, but remain an essential component in program sustainability.

To that end, the APRC is pleased to report that the Office of Advancement is already engaged in fundraising to address this issue. **[9]**

- 9) Reviewers of the SOM argued strongly for creation of a technical director position, citing concerns about health and safety as well as proper maintenance of expensive and sophisticated equipment in Denton,

University Hall, and the Festival Theatre. The APRC believes that the proposal has merit, but is only realistic if a cost recovery model can be identified.

To that end, the APRC recommends that the SOM, the Theatre program, and the office of Events Management jointly explore the feasibility of a shared staff technician, including generation of a model for cost recovery. Those discussions should also assess the need for change to existing policies around access to equipment in order to minimize risks. [7]

- 10) The APRC recognizes the need for a large number of part-time employees in the School, particularly for applied music positions, and that that need is unlikely to diminish in future. Existing procedures for part-time hiring are not well suited to the unit's needs, particularly for applied music positions, which require continuity of individuals over several years.

To that end, the APRC recommends that Senate bring to the Board of Governors' attention the unworkable nature of the part-time hiring process and its unintended negative consequences for the Music program. [2]

- 11) Acadia has a long history of supporting summer music camps. For many individuals, this is their first experience of Acadia. Reviewers recognized this, and recommended that the University assist in organization, running and tracking of the camps.

The APRC endorses this recommendation, and to that end encourages Open Acadia to resume responsibility for marketing and administering the program, while the SOM maintains responsibility for programming. [21]

Priority Level 3

- 12) The APRC recognizes that the present description of duties for Instructors in the School of Music (and possibly other units) may inadequately capture the diversity of present appointments.

To that end, the APRC requests that the Academic Planning Committee (APC) explore whether our current employment categories are best designed to meet our current and future needs. [3]

- 13) The SOM has felt the loss of dedicated custodial support for Denton Hall, with its specialized needs, and has expressed concern that expensive equipment might be compromised as a result.

To that end, the APRC recommends that the Senior Administration examine existing policies re: deployment of custodial resources, with particular attention to the relationship between services at Denton Hall and Festival Theatre Building (FTB). [6]