



Minutes of the Senate meeting of Monday 8th December, 2014

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 8th December, 2014 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Paul Doerr presiding and 38 present and 2 guests.

1) Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda, moved by D. Benoit, seconded by G. Bissix.

The Chair asked that Item 5) a) be moved up to 4) and to re-number everything after that.

There were no objections to the change.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS REVISED. APPROVED.

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

Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 10th November, 2014 as distributed. Moved by J. Banks, seconded by H. Wylie.

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

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES CARRIED.

3) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

The Chair welcomed R. Karsten who would be presenting the SPAC Report to Senate and J. Diamond who would be speaking in support of the T.I.E. Report to Senate.

Regrets were received from R. Murphy, C. Thompson, L. Sprado, J. Yang, R. Perrins and J. Cayford. A. Biro would be arriving late.

The Chair thanked J. Guiney Yallop for his time on Senate.

The Chair welcomed D. Green, the new Board member to Senate, and also welcomed P. Townsend to Senate.

b) From the President

President Ivany spoke about the Federal Government's Science and Technology strategy, drawing attention to the Canada First Research Excellence Fund (CFREF). President Ivany noted that this initiative was heavily weighted towards scale which made it unlikely that Acadia would see much of the funding. 1.5 billion dollars would be distributed.

J. Stanley noted that this was a familiar story and felt that there might be a way to engage other universities like Dalhousie in order to gain better access to the pool of money.

President Ivany responded that multiple efforts were being made to draw attention to the issue and noted that recently the University had met with the incoming Chair of NSERC and that the nature of the dialogue at that meeting showed sensitivity to the scale issue. In addition, this issue was being discussed within the U-4 League. It would be necessary to continue to be very strategic and continue to make the case for small universities on every possible front.

J. Slights asked for clarification about Acadia's standings in the 2014 MacLean's Rankings, noting that she had serious reservations about the way in which the rankings were calculated.

President Ivany shared J. Slights reservations about the MacLean's methodology. A change to the MacLean's methodology resulted in a major shift for Acadia this year over last year. The category 'Library Holdings per student', which was a category that Acadia ranked very high on, was removed altogether. The President acknowledged that there was also some erosion this year because Acadia had enrolment increases without concomitant increases in resources. This resulted in erosion at the same time that two western schools were moving up in the rankings. He noted that D. Currie could provide greater detail on the methodology associated with the MacLean's rankings if Senate was interested in more detail.

4) Priority Items

a) Report from SPAC Committee (*attached*)

R. Karsten presented the report from the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee and reported that 1100 students were offered scholarships in March and that 550 of the incoming students in September had renewable scholarships. R. Karsten noted that there was a slight decrease in the number of Tier 1 scholarship students (95% or higher in High School) and a significant increase in Tier 2 students (90 – 95%). R. Karsten felt that this could be because of the additional BMO \$1000 scholarship that was offered to Tier 2 students which may make Acadia more competitive in this tier than other institutions.

R. Karsten reported that the scholarship process was now electronic which was much more efficient for the committee.

A. Kiefte asked whether the Tier 1 scholarships were based on GPA or were the students ranked based on the ranking from the particular high school.

R. Karsten responded that the majority of the renewable scholarships (Tier 1 to Tier 4) were based solely on the student GPA. The Scholarship Committee then looks at the top 150 students, who are required to submit a full scholarship application including an essay describing their extra curricula activities. These applications are ranked by the committee and they no longer receive any student ranking from high schools.

P. Williams asked how these students perform once they are at Acadia.

R. Karsten noted that they did not have detailed records of how the students performed but noted that he sat on the Admissions and Academic Standing

(Appeals) Committee and did see students that were losing their renewable scholarships for a number of reasons. R. Karsten noted that Acadia tried to make the renewal process as flexible as possible and said that students who appealed were generally given an additional term to bring their marks back up to the required level.

G. Poulter asked whether it was easier for a student taking science courses at high school to get 95% or higher. G. Poulter asked whether Acadia was losing good Arts students because their marks from high school were too low for the Tier 1 scholarships.

R. Karsten stated that a pot of money for Arts students and Professional Studies students was set aside. This allowed the committee to give scholarships to students with slightly lower GPAs. R. Karsten stated that of the top 150 students about 80 would be entering Science programs.

A. Mitchell stated that in the past similar questions were asked of the Scholarship committee. An analysis of the high school marks in both English and Math revealed that they both tended to be the same, suggesting that whichever discipline was entered, the best students tended to have the best marks.

A. Kiefte asked whether there was an attempt to balance students coming from different regions in the Province and outside of the Province.

R. Karsten responded that there was no attempt to do so in the general scholarships, but that various specific scholarships existed that were targeted towards students from different regions. There were also adjustments for students who had taken the IB program at high school.

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

D. Serafini stated the T.I.E. committee had already met 10 times this fall and had been focused on exam scheduling and working towards a policy that could be followed. A draft document would be coming to Senate at a future date.

D. Serafini commented that there had been a very good response rate to the survey that had been circulated with over 1300 responses from the students and 180 from faculty. With regards to the fall Reading Week there was overwhelming support from the students. D. Serafini acknowledged that because of the way days fell on the calendars for 2016/17/18 it would be a challenge to get more days into the fall semester without having to extend the examination period.

D. Serafini stated that in January he would bring a draft document of calendar dates for the next three years to Senate that would allow forward planning to be done.

J. Diamond added that although the survey respondents were generally in favour of a fall reading week, there were a number of very negative comments and a feeling that those that didn't like it felt very strongly about the change. J. Diamond also noted that adding a week into the schedule put pressure at both ends of the term. More respondents wanted to start the term earlier but during the next few years this would mean starting in August because of where

Labour Day was falling in the calendar. It was recognised that Monday night classes were a particular challenge because of the number that could be missed in a term because of holidays.

J. Diamond stated that the T.I.E. committee had discussed their role and felt the need to update some of the alleged duties of the committee because some were clearly outdated. He had found these on the Senate website and Senate was asked to consider these in the future.

L. Murphy pointed out that Mt. Allison had now passed a fall Reading Week and that it would be useful to have a conversation with them to see how they intended to schedule their fall term.

D. Serafini had been in contact with the Registrar at Mt. Allison and noted that they would like to align with Acadia, especially as they are a U4 institution. Dalhousie University was also interested in holding a fall Reading Week.

D. Seamone asked whether the Fall 2015 Reading Week would coincide with the Thanksgiving Holiday to reduce the impact on Monday classes.

D. Serafini confirmed that it would coincide with Thanksgiving.

H. Wylie asked which document contained these responsibilities for the T.I.E. committee.

D. Benoit read sections from a document on the Registrar's page under 'Faculty Information', suggesting that the Chair of the T.I.E. Committee should be contacting professors to ask them to serve as a Chief Proctor, whereas the practise for many years had been for the Registrar to make this request. The web page also suggested that the Chief Proctor report to the T.I.E. Committee any irregularities. About three years ago the requirement to complete the 'Alternate Method of Evaluation' form ended.

A. Kiefte stated that Memorial University used to hold a three day Reading Break around Remembrance Day and wondered whether there was quantitative data from the recent survey. Were people asked what their preference would be for the Break taking place around Thanksgiving or Remembrance Day?

J. Diamond confirmed that a question like that was not asked but noted that written comments were strongly in favour of a Reading Week combined with the Thanksgiving Holiday. This would fall more in the middle of the term.

B. Anderson asked whether the T.I.E. Committee would be bringing recommendations for the examination schedule to Senate. B. Anderson also asked whether examinations could be scheduled on a Sunday.

D. Serafini stated that there was some support for Sunday examinations both from Faculty and students. It would be necessary to respect Acadia's roots and also consider a Religious Accommodations Policy. D. Serafini felt that there was a limit to what the T.I.E. Committee could do in this respect.

D. Serafini noted that the T.I.E. Committee would look at scheduling of examinations and that it needed to become more student centered. The process of examinations needed to be supported and a transparent policy was needed.

J. Diamond noted that students were 54 to 46% in favour of Sunday examinations with faculty being a little more heavily in favour.

D. Benoit noticed this year that students had a lot of work to do prior to Reading Week because faculty needed to have sufficient material to mark prior to the drop deadline date. This resulted in students finding that they had little to do during the Reading Week. D. Benoit asked whether this would be addressed next year.

D. Serafini confirmed that next year the drop deadline date would fall two weeks after the Reading Week so that students should find they had plenty to do during the week.

D. Benoit asked whether all mid-terms might then occur during the week after Reading Week.

D. Serafini stated that the week after Thanksgiving Day would be week 9 or 10 in the term and that students should already have 15% of their marks back by that time.

H. Wylie noted that this was the second time that it had been brought to Senate's attention that there were policies floating around that had implications for various Senate committees. H. Wylie suggested a 'note to self' for the Chair to have Senate Executive engage in a study of what policies were in place so that there could be consistency across the board.

c) Report from Curriculum Committee

D. Serafini reported that the Curriculum committee had already met a number of times and had just begun to review the curriculum proposals. Regarding curriculum reform a decision had been made to work through the By-laws committee until recommendations came forward from there. The committee was committed to keeping reform in mind as they went through the curriculum proposals for this year and feedback had been offered to the By-laws committee.

D. Serafini noted that there would be two more meetings during December and he expressed thanks to R. Raeside for his help in moving the process along, acknowledging that it was a great deal of work.

5) New Business
a) President's Report
(Previously circulated)

President Ivany pointed out that in the report he had drawn attention to national trends in Canada, particularly those that had the most impact on Acadia, in addition to reviewing the Nova Scotia environment and the Acadia-specific environment.

President Ivany noted that the CFREF Report mentioned earlier underscored the challenge that Acadia faced nationally. There had been a marked change to

Canadian higher education during the 1980's and 1990's. AUCC used to have a small university caucus that met annually and included institutions such as Brock and Wilfred Laurier. These institutions have grown since that time and are no longer in the same space (model) as Acadia. Over the last 25 years there has been a decline in the number of institutions that occupy the same space as Acadia – one that commits to being a high quality, high engagement undergraduate institution.

President Ivany commented the trend appeared to be driven, at least in part, from the flawed belief that the mature state of a small undergraduate university would be a larger comprehensive university. This movement was aided by increased funding from government for growth. A further incentive was often added for institutions to increase the size of their graduate programs.

President Ivany noted that Acadia existed in a regime where growth and increased graduate programming had provided an opportunity for institutions to improve their funding and resource base. This sort of mind set was problematic for Acadia, especially once recent changes to Federal funding (granting councils) were factored in.

President Ivany stressed that the argument Acadia had made was based on the Canadian higher education 'ecosystem' where small high quality universities (like Acadia) produced outstanding undergraduates that went on to top graduate schools at large research-intensive institutions in Canada and elsewhere.

President Ivany stated that unless he was told differently by Senate and the Board of Governors he would want Acadia to continue to occupy the space it currently held, despite the current trend. He noted that in the universities and colleges similar to an Acadia model in the US there was little confusion, as they did not view growth as a primary marker of their development and success. The U-4 initiative came about in Canada because there are very few small universities left and that there needed to be a 'voice' for these high-quality/high-engagement institutions.

President Ivany stated that in Nova Scotia there was a need to move past the debate about whether the number of institutions in Nova Scotia was an asset or a liability to the Province. Great energy was being spent on this debate. He acknowledged that Nova Scotia was in a difficult position because of the Federal PSE transfers continuing on a per capita basis instead of on a per student basis. Nova Scotia was the most successful Province in attracting students from out of the Province and several universities had in excess of 30% of students from outside of the Province and yet received no funding benefit.

President Ivany also discussed the way in which Acadia was put at risk as a result of the long term debt levels. At the same time Acadia's enrolment fell sharply while enrolment was rising in other institutions in the Province. This financial situation was exacerbated when the Province introduced a new enrolment-weighted funding formula in 2008 that saw Acadia's proportion of the funding envelope decline by approximately \$7 million. The combined impact of these circumstances represented a serious financial threat and the university continues to suffer the consequences to this day.

President Ivany noted that the two big losers were Acadia and Cape Breton University. Institutions were still trying to find a way to make the model work, at the same time acknowledging that there were fewer dollars in the pot. Tuition would continue to be regulated and constraints were likely to continue. President Ivany pointed out that although Acadia had steadily improved its financial position in recent years, it often did not feel that way because the university was recovering from a very deep hole. Acadia's turnaround was further hampered by a 10% operating grant reduction between 2010-13. In spite of these challenges, President Ivany felt that Acadia had made sufficient progress such that it was now possible to talk of a 50+ year horizon. It would be necessary to make judgements on policies and align decisions to sustain the Acadia model in terms of class size and student/faculty interaction. President Ivany felt that it was incumbent on Acadia to establish a model where it was possible to have and to attract faculty that were deeply committed to their teaching but also deeply committed to their research programs and interested in exposing undergraduate students to that research. This combination of high quality teaching and first-rate research experience must continue to reside at the core of Acadia's academic values and we must continue to pursue every possible option to make our academic model financially sustainable.

A. Kiefte asked whether the University had made efforts to increase funding through donors to improve the funding situation at Acadia, particularly for the student experience with summer intern opportunities.

President Ivany responded that the Advancement revenue was now up about 140% over the last two years. The challenge within the donor community was that it was often more attractive to provide money for buildings or student awards. Although Acadia had enjoyed some success in both of these areas it was more difficult to get large donations for Chairs, internships and similar areas.

President Ivany noted however that the \$1 million gift from Dr. Tom Raddall and his family for the Biology Department would directly benefit students and faculty and stood as an example of the kind of donation that could help Acadia academically. Given an environment with minimal growth in government grants and regulated tuition, it is clear that a greater percentage of the revenue that comes to the institution in the future will have to come from philanthropy.

A. Kiefte asked whether there were new innovative ways in which the Advancement Office could work with the Academic Sector.

President Ivany agreed and stated that a number of projects were in progress that would require money from the corporate sector in order to advance it. He pointed out that Patterson Hall renovations were being carried out for the School of Business as a result of work done by the Advancement Office and Mr. Bruce Gallaway on a "Twenty Wing Project" that raised \$2million. Senators were encouraged to contact the Advancement Office if they felt that they had projects that could benefit from corporate funding.

G. Gibson noted that a large number of the Biology students were carrying out research for their Honours but she did not feel that this fact was being

promoted well. G. Gibson felt that Welcome Week could include an Honours Research Symposium and that the Acadia web page could include more information.

President Ivany agreed that the rich research experience of Acadia students (particularly Honours students) was so far from the norm that it required extra effort to communicate those stories clearly and that more could be done to 'tell our story'.

- b) Graduate Curriculum changes 2015-2016 (*attached*)

Motion to approve the name change of the Master of Recreation Management (MRM) to Master of Community Development (MCD). Moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by D. Benoit.

D. MacKinnon spoke to the motion and stated that following the separation of the School of Recreation Management into the School of Kinesiology and the Department of Community Development, these changes would reflect the name change and also reflect changes to the graduate degree that was being offered. Recreation Management cast a fairly small net, whereas Community Development would cast a wider net, which would assist in attracting graduate students.

G. Bissix had provided an overview and suggested that this allowed the department to move their graduate degree to coincide with what was being offered at the undergraduate level.

MOTION CARRIED.

There being no other business there was a Motion to Adjourn at 5:30 p.m., moved by D. Benoit.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

ACADIA UNIVERSITY

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

REPORT DATE: November 20, 2014

SPAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Membership	July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014	July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015
Arts	Xiaoting Wang (Stephen Ahern on sabbatical)	Stephen Ahern
	Diemo Landgraf	Diemo Landgraf
	Stephanie Bethune (Student Rep)	Connor Thompson (Student Rep)
Professional Studies	Scott Landry	Scott Landry (Committee Chair January to June 2015)
	Igor Semenenko	Igor Semenenko
	Hector Rode Arreola (Student Rep)	Hector Rode Arreola (Student Rep)
Pure & Applied Science	Jennie Rand	Anthony Tong
	Richard Karsten (Committee Chair)	Richard Karsten (Committee Chair July to December 2014)
		Cindy Trudel (January to June 2015 as Richard Karsten will be on sabbatical)
	Brett Ells (Student Rep)	Ryan Densmore (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 2013-2014 on the following dates:
 December 3, 2013
 March 24, 2014

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 2013-2014 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
- Six International Baccalaureate Scholarships each valued at \$6,500 renewable
- Eight Scholarships for AVRSB students each valued at \$4,000 renewable

2. Awarding of 2014 Entrance Scholarships

Through the entrance scholarship process, 1132 prospective students were offered entrance scholarships or scholar-bursaries for the 2014-15 academic year. This included renewable entrance merit based scholarships to all incoming students (in their first undergraduate degree) with a scholarship average of above 80%. The acceptance rate for 2014 was 48% with 549 accepting their entrance scholarship offer (approximately \$1.7 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. No changes were made. For the 2014-2015 recruitment cycle an online electronic form was used. As a student's admission file contains their transcript, a paper copy is no longer needed on the scholarship file except for transfer students. Committee files were electronic for the 2014-2015 entrance scholarship process.

4. Academic Requirements for Grade Based Entrance Scholarships:

For 2014-2015 the entrance scholarship program criteria did not change from the previous year.

The scholarship program uses a combined average – a weighted average using grade 11 and grade 12 to calculate a scholarship average.

The scholarship average grid for 2014-2015

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% also receive a \$1000 non-renewable BMO Financial Group Entrance Scholarship for the 2014-2015 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont

Pamela D'Entremont
Secretary

RK

Richard Karsten
Chair

Graduate Curriculum Changes for 2015-2016
Submitted by Research and Graduate Studies
Approved by Senate Committee of Graduate Studies

Proposal to change the degree Master of Recreation Management to Master of Community Development

This change is in line with the changes that have already been approved by Senate and the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC) to the Bachelor of Recreation Management degree. This degree transitioned to the Bachelor of Community Development in the 2013-14 academic year and subsequently led to the formation of a Department of Community Development at Acadia University.

Beyond the degree name change, the degree structure and required resources remains the same as before. However, there are proposed changes to course names and descriptions.

- Proposed Modification to program:

Contact Information

Room 380 Acadia Athletic Complex

Phone: (902) 585-1307; Fax: (902) 585-1702; Email: kim.vaughan@acadiau.ca.

Web: <http://commdev.acadiau.ca>

Head of Department: [Dr. Glyn Bissix](#)

Graduate Program Coordinator: [Dr. John Colton](#)

Admission

As stated in the [Admissions](#) section of this calendar.

Application Deadline

February 1 is the deadline for applicants who wish to be considered for university funding. Other applications will be considered as received.

Curriculum

Each candidate will take CODE 5033 (Community Development Seminar), CODE 5056 (Community Development Practicum), CODE 5073 (Research Methods), 3h advanced course with approval of the student's graduate advisor, and CODE 5960 (Thesis).

- Proposed Modifications to existing courses

Current Course Prefix, Number, Title and Description:

RECR 5693 INTEGRATIVE SEMINAR IN LEISURE STUDIES

The seminar comprises an investigation of the relationships among the concepts, issues and problems associated with leisure and recreation. It is a theory-based approach to the process of identifying and critically examining the conditions which influence leisure in contemporary society. Seminars consist of discussions relative to student presentations and prescribed readings.

Proposed New Course Prefix, Number, Title and Description:

CODE 5033 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR

The seminar comprises an investigation of the relationships among the concepts, issues and problems associated with community development. It is a theory-based approach to the process of identifying and critically examining the conditions which influence community development in contemporary society. Seminars consist of discussions relative to student presentations and prescribed readings.

Current Course Prefix, Number, Title and Description:

RECR 5543 LEISURE RESEARCH

This course examines the application of research techniques and methodologies to leisure and recreation. The topics include discussion of current leisure research and evaluation, methodologies and analyses and research design.

Proposed New Prefix, Course Number, Title and Description:

CODE 5073 RESEARCH METHODS

This course examines the application of research techniques and methodologies to community development. The topics include discussion of current community development and evaluation, methodologies and analyses and research design.

Current Course Prefix, Number, Title and Description:

RECR 5113 SELECTED TOPICS IN RECREATION MANAGEMENT

Review and analysis of selected topics in recreation management. Specific topics, format and content of course are negotiated on an individual or small group basis with members of the faculty.

Proposed New Course Prefix, Number, Title and Description:

CODE 5513 APPLIED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Review and analysis of selected topics in community development. Specific topics, format and content of course are negotiated on an individual or small group basis with members of the faculty.

Current Course Prefix, Number and Description:

RECR 5553 RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM

Students will identify major questions associated with leisure and recreation, develop and apply appropriate research strategies for investigation, write and defend a paper. A summary suitable for publication should be included.

Proposed New Course Prefix, Number and Description:

CODE 5533 RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM

Students will identify major questions associated with community development, develop and apply appropriate research strategies for investigation, write and defend a paper. A summary suitable for publication should be included.

Current Course Prefix, Number, Title and Description:

RECR 5123 SELECTED TOPICS IN LEISURE THEORY

Review and analysis of selected topics in leisure theory. Specific topics, format and content of course are negotiated on an individual or small group basis with members of the faculty.

Proposed New Course Prefix, Number, Title and Description:

CODE 5553 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT THEORY

Review and analysis of selected topics in community development theory. Specific topics, format and content of course are negotiated on an individual or small group basis with members of the faculty.

Current Prefix:

RECR 5960 GRADUATE THESIS

Every candidate must prepare an approved thesis based on original work under the direction of a supervisor appointed by the school.

Proposed New Prefix:

CODE 5960 GRADUATE THESIS

Every candidate must prepare an approved thesis based on original work under the direction of a supervisor appointed by the school.

Reason for the above changes: The field of Recreation Management has been evolving over the last two decades as have the evolution of the course content of the program and the expertise of faculty. Originally in the 1970's and 1980s, the field was anchored in the theory and concepts of leisure and individual wellness, and concepts of community wellness and community development were an aspect of this approach. At this time, a majority of our graduates were moving into positions involving the administration and delivery of recreation programming, particularly at a municipal level. There was a societal emphasis on governments providing programming to the general population. This has been shifting consistently over time.

The field has changed and there is a recognition of a holistic and systems approach to wellbeing that is grounded in a broader context of social, psychological, physical, spiritual, and intellectual wellness which is facilitated by community capitals and context. Community development theories and approaches have come to the fore including asset-based community development, community resiliency and community capitals. Health, wellness, culture, social support, heritage, culture and economy are increasingly seen as interconnected in a community context. Leisure concepts have become one aspect of this approach rather than the defining concepts within it. At a professional level, governments have moved away from offering direct services in communities to seeing their role as facilitating the development of initiatives by citizens and community organizations. In numerous municipalities across the country such as Calgary, Halifax and Wolfville, "recreation" has been either demoted in the organizational structure or eliminated as a title, typically being replaced by "community development" or "community services". A "Recreation Director" no longer sits at the senior management table. Consistent with these changes, only a small number of our MRM graduates now move into official "recreation" positions and instead are working in a multitude of roles from health promotion and active living to sustainability planning, community and environmental education, adventure education, community tourism, work with youth-at-risk, services for persons with challenges, administration and development of non-profits, and teaching, to name a few. The field of recreation is seen as narrower and less frequently attached to professional level and administrative and policy positions. Over the last several years we have received feedback from both students and parents that "community development" is a more attractive option for a degree. In short, community development represents a title that better describes the evolution of the field and the expertise and content of our program.