

Office of the Senate Secretariat

Acadia University  
Wolfville, Nova Scotia  
Canada B0P 1X0

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



Minutes of the Senate meeting of Monday 9<sup>th</sup> March, 2015

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> March, 2015 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Paul Doerr presiding and 48 present, plus one guest.

**1) Approval of Agenda**

The Chair stated that before the agenda could be approved he would like to add Item 4) Business Arising from the Minutes. The previous Item 4) New Business would be re-numbered to Item 5).

There were no objections to the changes.

**Motion to approve the agenda moved by R. Perrins, seconded by J. Hennessy.**

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA APPROVED.

**2) Minutes of the Meeting of  
9<sup>th</sup> February, 2015**

**Motion to approve the minutes of February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2015. Moved by B. Brackney, seconded by H. Wylie.**

A. Quema requested the following change to text on Page 4 of the minutes.  
*“While faculty members on the Curriculum committee do peruse the whole document, it still remains for Senators from the three Faculties to discuss and read the document at Senate, to catch any mistakes that may have been made.”*

A. Quema also referred to the process that had been followed at the previous Senate meeting while motions were being passed with regard to language in the APC document. A. Quema had since consulted the Roberts Rules and talked with others, and now felt that a ‘Motion to Reconsider’ should have been adopted. This was not done and A. Quema was concerned that a proper process had not been followed.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS REVISED CARRIED.

**3) Announcements**

**a) From the Chair of Senate**

The Chair noted regrets from S. McCullough, P. Connelly, J. MacLeod, J. Eustace.

The Chair welcomed F. Thompson, the incoming ASU VP Academic as a guest of Senate.

There were no objections to F. Thompson attending.

**b) From the VP Academic**

R. Perrins reported from the three Faculties.

In the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science A.Tong (Chemistry) was part of a \$585,000 NSERC Strategic Project Grant to research ways to reduce harmful bacteria in waste water. They will be working with researchers at Dalhousie and municipal wastewater treatment plant partners in Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, PEI and Nunavut to develop new processes that reduce antibiotic-resistant bacteria.

In the Faculty of Arts D. Charke and M. Adam (Music) were both nominated for an East Coast Music Award in the Classical Recording of the Year category for their CD 'Kitchen Party'.

P. Togni recently won the Lieutenant Governor Masterworks Arts Award of \$25,000 for his orchestral composition *Responsio*. Fourth year composition student A. Clarke, was selected to receive the Norman McLeod Rodgers Memorial Overseas Scholarship, to pursue a Master's degree in Music in Berlin, Germany. Two of the graduating voice majors; Katie Cochrane and Jodie Alcorn were accepted to Opera Nuova, Canada's largest Opera Summer Opera Festiva, which hosts a select group of emerging artists from around the County.

In the Faculty of Professional Studies P. Corkum (Business) had been awarded the prestigious designation of Fellow Chartered Accountant from the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nova Scotia. This is the Institute's highest honour and is awarded to long-standing members who have rendered meritorious service to the institution.

E. Callaghan (Business) was awarded the Vinnova Sweden – Marie-Curie Incoming Grant valued at approximately \$300,000 over the next three years. The grant supports the further development of a relationship between Acadia University and Blekinge Institute of Technology (Sweden) to promote innovation for sustainable development. Researchers will work on sustainable food systems.

D. Kruisselbrink (Kinesiology) has been working on High Risk Drinking for some time. The American organization NCHIP which joined Acadia in 2011 has now wrapped up. Acadia's NCHIP team felt the initiative was of value and a Canadian version should be formed. Led by President Ivany, S. Mesheau and supported by student, faculty and staff, a Canadian university/college collaborative to address high risk drinking has been agreed upon.

**c) From the President**

President Ivany reported on the Provincial Memorandum of Understanding noting that the Bi-lateral process that was started in the Fall had been intended to bridge the system until the next MOU which would not be until March 2016. President Ivany provided an update on the review processes that were embedded in the Bi-lateral agreements because they were more typical of the three year cycles that the Universities used to be in with the Government.

President Ivany reminded Senate that there were system wide reviews in progress for Nutrition & Dietetics, Teacher Education, and in Engineering. The review that was furthest along was the Nutrition & Dietetics, in part thanks to the leadership of B. Anderson, and they had now been meeting for several months. President Ivany noted that the Teacher Education review had changed in mid-stream. It had originally been announced that the process would be led by Mount Saint Vincent University but was later changed to tie

the Teacher Education to the review of the Public Education System. This caused some delay but President Ivany stated that he and H. Hemming had attended the first meeting of the process. He felt that the Provincial Department of Education saw a partnership with the University sector and wanted them to provide a key response to the panel review.

President Ivany noted that the review of Engineering would be led by Dalhousie and that this had not yet begun.

President Ivany asked Senate to keep the reviews on its radar screen because the potential for these reviews to have implications for any institution delivering these programs existed.

#### 4) Business Arising from the Minutes

The Chair asked J. Hennessy to speak to a motion to amend something previously adopted.

#### **Motion to amend something previously adopted. Moved by J. Hennessy, seconded by H. Wyle.**

J. Hennessy reminded Senate that at the previous meeting there had been an amendment to the APC motion that would have removed paragraph 4 of Page 2, and turned it into a footnote instead. This passed and was followed by a subsequent amendment that added clarifying language to the paragraph but that also reversed the previous amendment. J. Hennessy noted that according to Robert's Rules, that should not have happened and that strictly speaking there should have been a 'Motion to Reconsider' brought forward by a Senator that have previously voted in favour of the original motion.

J. Hennessy was therefore bringing forward a motion to amend something previously adopted and at the same time including wording that would further clarify the intent of the APC.

The motion would now read as follows and include a footnote:

#### **Acadia University Permanent Faculty Application Request Template**

1. When considering requests for the staffing of permanent faculty positions the University Senate and the Academic Planning Committee will be guided by the following principles:
  - a. Continue to ensure that there is a rich diversity in our academic programming which reflects the strong liberal education tradition of the university;
  - b. Foster opportunities for interdisciplinary synergies among program and units which allow for the development of program/subject areas; together with the capabilities needed to offer them effectively, consistent with the tenets expressed in Acadia's Mission, Vision, and Senate's definition of "An Acadia Education"; and
  - c. Respect the variety of pedagogical practices necessary to offer academic programming consonant with our strong liberal educational orientation.
2. Requests for permanent faculty will be made using this template and should be kept to a maximum of three (3) pages. While it is recognized that Acadia's diverse and rich academic environment means that requests for

permanent faculty will exhibit some variability, all requests should explicitly address each of the individual factors enumerated in paragraph 3 below.

3. In accordance with its mandate to make recommendations to Senate for the staffing of permanent faculty positions, the Academic Planning Committee will use the following factors when assessing requests;<sup>1</sup>
- a. To what extent does the proposed request align with the definition of an Acadia Education and Acadia's Mission and Vision and how does the request contribute to the achievement of Acadia's stated institutional goals and priorities?
  - b. To what extent does the proposed request enrich and enhance the academic capacity of a program(s) or subject area(s)?
  - c. To what extent does the proposed request support institutional integrity and to what extent does it contribute to the overall diversity and viability of Acadia's academic environment?

<sup>1</sup> The University Registrar will provide *some* core data (FCE, FTE, trends, etc.) to all units and programs so that units and programs may use this data at their discretion. It is recognized that this data may not address the needs of all departments and units, and therefore the use of additional and pertinent quantitative and qualitative data is also encouraged. Additional supporting information may either be incorporated directly into the request template – i.e., if it addresses a specific factor(s) - or it may be appended to the final section of this template.

G. Gibson appreciated the changes but asked what the rationale was for the Registrar to provide only some Core data.

J. Hennessy responded that Core data in this case would mean the bulk of the data that could be provided but that there could be other data that the Registrar would provide or that the department would provide.

A. Quema asked whether the motion was being debated.

J. Hennessy explained that because he had not given the seven day 'Notice of Motion' it was necessary for 2/3 of the Senators present or a majority of the voting members of Senate to approve the motion.

J. Slights encouraged Senators to support the motion and pointed out that it provided the clarity that was wanted at the last meeting of Senate.

A. Quema would also be voting for the motion but questioned why this text was being presented as a footnote since the principle was very important to the process.

B. Anderson was also in support of the change and thanked J. Hennessy for his efforts in providing extra clarity.

J. Hennessy noted that the change was the result of discussions with the Faculty of Arts Senators and was a joint effort.

---

MOTION TO AMEND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

**5) New Business**

- a) Honorary Degree Nominations from the Awards Committee  
*(previously circulated)*

**Motion to approve the candidates for Honorary Degree status as nominated by the Awards Committee. Moved by R. Ivany, seconded by C. Lathem.**

President Ivany provided background on the process for nomination and selection.

B. Anderson noted that it was important to do a better job to ensure that there was a better equity of candidates with regard to gender. B. Anderson was sorry that she had not put forward names of women that would have been worthy candidates for Honorary Degrees.

President Ivany was in agreement and noted that this year was the lowest number of nominations that Acadia had received.

A. Quema also reinforced B. Anderson's comments and pointed out that gender, not just in the sense of women, needed to be as broad as possible.

H. Wylie noted that it was gratifying to see nominees coming from the Mi'kmaw community.

A secret ballot was conducted.

CANDIDATES FOR HONORARY DEGREES APPROVED.

- b) **Professor Emeritus Nominations from the Awards committee**

**Motion to approve the nomination for Professor Emeritus status. Moved by R. Ivany and seconded by G. Bissix.**

President Ivany noted that T. Herman needed no introduction to Senate and that he had been nominated by the Biology Department. President Ivany encouraged Senators to ask departments to nominate strong candidates.

A. Kiefte asked whether Professor Emeritus nominations had to wait until a faculty member had retired.

President Ivany reminded Senate that three years ago departments were asked to go back five years and consider applicants because there appeared to have been a gap but that now Acadia would proceed on a normal cycle. Candidates could be considered the year of their retirement or the next year. President Ivany felt that this might be re-visited because that might not be the only time that someone could be considered.

A secret ballot was conducted.

G. Bissix asked about the request some time ago to grant Emeritus status to Instructors.

President Ivany responded that this matter would be addressed at the next meeting of the Awards committee.

MOTION TO APPROVE CANDIDATE FOR PROFESSOR EMERITUS APPROVED.

- c) **Election to replace vacancy on the Nominating Committee**
- D. Serafini stated that he had sent out a call for nominations to the three Faculties but had received no responses. I. Hutchinson had agreed to serve another term and was therefore elected by acclamation.
- d) **Notice of Motion from the By-laws Committee**
- B. Anderson spoke to the Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee and noted that there were four motions that would be coming to the next Senate meeting. These were the result of collaborative work by the By-laws committee.

**Motion to adjourn at 4:40 p.m.**

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

---

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

**MOTION TO AMEND SOMETHING PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED:** To amend the Acadia University Permanent Faculty Application Request Template adopted at the February 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of senate. The amendment converts the numbered paragraph 4 to a footnote of paragraph 3 and adds the italicized language.

Note: This motion is being introduced without notice and will therefore require a 2/3 majority of the assembly or a simple majority of the entire voting membership to be adopted.

### **Acadia University Permanent Faculty Application Request Template**

1. When considering requests for the staffing of permanent faculty positions the University Senate and the Academic Planning Committee will be guided by the following principles:
  - d. Continue to ensure that there is a rich diversity in our academic programming which reflects the strong liberal education tradition of the university;
  - e. Foster opportunities for interdisciplinary synergies among program and units which allow for the development of program/subject areas; together with the capabilities needed to offer them effectively, consistent with the tenets expressed in Acadia's Mission, Vision, and Senate's definition of "An Acadia Education"; and
  - f. Respect the variety of pedagogical practices necessary to offer academic programming consonant with our strong liberal educational orientation.
2. Requests for permanent faculty will be made using this template and should be kept to a maximum of three (3) pages. While it is recognized that Acadia's diverse and rich academic environment means that requests for permanent faculty will exhibit some variability, all requests should explicitly address each of the individual factors enumerated in paragraph 3 below.
3. In accordance with its mandate to make recommendations to Senate for the staffing of permanent faculty positions, the Academic Planning Committee will use the following factors when assessing requests;<sup>2</sup>
  - d. To what extent does the proposed request align with the definition of an Acadia Education and Acadia's Mission and Vision and how does the request contribute to the achievement of Acadia's stated institutional goals and priorities?
  - e. To what extent does the proposed request enrich and enhance the academic capacity of a program(s) or subject area(s)?
  - f. To what extent does the proposed request support institutional integrity and to what extent does it contribute to the overall diversity and viability of Acadia's academic environment?

---

<sup>2</sup> The University Registrar will provide *some* core data (FCE, FTE, trends, etc.) to all units and programs so that units and programs may use this data at their discretion. It is recognized that this data may not address the needs of all departments and units, and therefore the use of additional and pertinent quantitative and qualitative data is also encouraged. Additional supporting information may either be incorporated directly into the request template – i.e., if it addresses a specific factor(s) - or it may be appended to the final section of this template.

### **Permanent Faculty Application Form**

Factor 1: To what extent does the proposed request align with the definition of an Acadia Education and Acadia's Mission and Vision and how does the request contribute to the achievement of Acadia's stated institutional goals and priorities?

Factor 2: To what extent does the request enrich and enhance the academic capacity of a program(s) or subject area(s)?

Factor 3: To what extent does the request support institutional integrity and to what extent does it contribute to the overall diversity and viability of Acadia's environment?



## **Notice of Motions (4) to Senate from the By-Laws Committee related to modifications to Senate Committee Structure**

March 2015

### By-law Motions:

1. That the Academic Technologies Committee and the Faculty Development Committee be merged to form a Faculty Support Committee, retaining the membership structure of the former.
2. That the Admission and Academic Standing Committee (Appeals) be changed from a standing committee to an ad hoc committee, to be constituted as needed from a pool of eligible and willing members, including some Senators.
3. That the Academic Discipline Appeals Committee be changed from a standing committee to an ad hoc committee, to be constituted as needed from a pool of eligible and willing members, including some Senators.
4. That the Curriculum Committee be divided into two standing committees: Curriculum Committee (Administrative), which would be responsible for duty one of the present mandate; and Curriculum Committee (Policy), which would be responsible for duties two to five of the present mandate.

### Background:

These motions stem from a review of the structure, mandates, and operations of Senate committees, a task that the By-laws Committee was requested to undertake by Senate late in 2012. The process was in part the result of several concerns:

- That there were too many Senate committees,
- That there were Senate committees needing to do little work and/or meeting very rarely, and,
- Furthermore, there was a strong sense that the Senate Committees were too compartmentalized, too reactive rather than proactive, and their work did not always align with the mandate of Senate, but were in fact the mandate of professional staff.

The notice-of motion is the result of wide consultation with Senators and members of Senate Committees. The By-laws Committee invited input on the state of Senate committees on a series of occasions:

- Through inviting committee chairs in the spring and summer of 2013 to provide their input;
- By holding consultative meetings throughout the fall of 2014 with members of Senate committees, clustered together for purposes of the review, and;
- By soliciting feedback from committees subsequent to those consultative meetings.

The general observations and specific motions reflect both the feedback received, the By-laws committee members' deliberations on how Senate might best be reshaped to make it more active, more efficient, and more constructively deliberative, as well as feedback from the Senate Executive, received in January 2015.

### General Observations:

An important point with which to preface the motions is that while some problems or concerns may be resolved with changes to some Committees and/or mandates, there are equally important considerations that are better addressed through changes in Senate culture and practices. These considerations include:

- The need for greater communication between committees with mutual interests and complementary mandates;
- The need for a greater emphasis on policy and proactivity;
- The need for greater oversight of and accountability for Senate committee work.

The process of consulting members of the various Committees about the possibility of reconfiguring Senate Committees also led to the raising of a number of concerns that were not readily addressed at the level of change to Senate By-laws but that nonetheless may need to be addressed by Senate in some fashion:

- Tension between the work of Senate committees and that of paid staff;
- Committees with overlapping mandates;
- Inconsistency between Senate committee mandates and the work the committees actually do;
- Discrepancies between the mandates of Senate committees and the descriptions of the roles and duties of the committees posted on other Acadia information sources.

While some of these considerations could potentially be addressed at the level of by-law change, the By-laws Committee restricted its proposals to those that clearly align with the task we were assigned by Senate.

By-law modifications summarized:

1. That the Academic Technologies Committee and the Faculty Development Committee be merged to form a Faculty Support Committee, retaining the membership structure of the former.

Rationale: *These committees see their duties as complementary and overlapping and there is general support for the idea of combining them.*

Other considerations: *The Committees require that the VPA or a delegate needs to be on the committee to ensure their support. It was also noted that it is important that the overall objectives of both committees be incorporated into a Faculty Support Committee.*

2. That the Admission and Academic Standing Committee (Appeals) be changed from a standing committee to an ad hoc committee, to be constituted as needed from a pool of eligible and willing members, including some Senators.

Rationale: *This committee does its work as needed; therefore it isn't required to be a standing committee, and constituting it on an ad hoc basis from a pool of available members will help it to be more timely and efficient, something that was felt to be lacking with the current approach.*

3. That the Academic Discipline Appeals Committee be changed from a standing committee to an ad hoc committee, to be constituted as needed from a pool of eligible and willing members, including some Senators.

Rationale: *This committee does its work as needed; therefore it isn't required to be a standing committee, and constituting it on an ad hoc basis from a pool of available members will help it to be more timely and efficient, something that was felt to be lacking with the current approach.*

4. That the Curriculum Committee be divided into two standing committees:

Curriculum Committee (Administrative), which would be responsible for duty one of the present mandate; and Curriculum Committee (Policy), which would be responsible for duties two to five of the present mandate.

Rationale: *Members of the Curriculum Committee have long contended that the heavy burden of the committee's administrative work prevents it from engaging with important considerations beyond that*

*central task of the committee. Dividing the committee into two will allow members of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) to engage in long-term planning and other policy matters. There would need to be a process to ensure effective sharing and communication between these two curriculum-focused committees.*

*Other considerations: It was noted by the Chair of the Curriculum Committee that, “all curriculum committee members have responded in favour of the proposed changes to this committee. The only thing raised ... is the importance of ensuring the 2 committees are closely connected.” There needs to be care that a Policy Committee that is focused on curriculum has meetings and is proactive. There was also support from some of the Committee reinforcing that attention needs to be paid to changes in Senate culture and practices.*

Two additional proposals for Committee modifications were made by the By-Laws Committee, and although there seemed to be openness to considering changes during discussions held with groups of Committee members in the fall, they were not supported in a summary document sent to Committees in December 2014, so are not being proposed at this time.

**Senate By-Laws Committee**

Barb Anderson, Chair  
William Brackney  
Jim MacLeod  
Herb Wyle, Recorder