

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 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2016

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Ann Vibert presiding and 35 present, plus four guests.

**1) Approval of Agenda**

**Motion to approve the agenda moved by R. Perrins, seconded by F. Thompson.**

D. Holmberg requested that Item 4) g) be moved above Item 4) f) on the agenda.

There were no objections to this change.

AGENDA APPROVED AS AMENDED.

**2) Minutes of the Meeting of  
14<sup>th</sup> March, 2016**

**Motion to approve the minutes of March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Moved by E. Patterson, seconded by W. Brackney.**

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES CARRIED.

**3) Announcements**

**a) From the Chair of Senate**

The Chair noted regrets from President Ivany, C. Visser, S. McCullough, M. Lukeman, J. Stanley, G. Poulter, D. Seamone, J. Cayford and R. Perrins.

The Chair welcomed S. Hewitt from the Curriculum Committee, S. Landry from the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee, B. Jarvin (incoming ASU VP Academic) and S. Sproule (incoming ASU President) to the Senate meeting.

There were no objections to these four guests attending.

The Chair stated that she had attended a Budget Advisory committee meeting in March and that a follow up meeting will be scheduled in April. The Chair offered to report on these meetings at the May meeting of Senate.

H. Gardner informed Senators that all six candidates for the Honorary Degree had been notified and had accepted the invitation to attend the 2016 Convocation, where they would receive their Honorary Degrees.

The Chair reminded Senators that she would be keeping a Speakers List and that each Senator would be given two opportunities to speak to the motion. The Chair noted that her role was not to curtail discussion but was to facilitate it by making sure that all Senators got an opportunity to speak.

The Chair stated that Senators were able to curtail the discussion if they wished to do so.

4) **New Business**

- a) **Motion from the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee that Senate approve the proposed changes and wording to the committee duties and the addition of a committee quorum and the listing of the sub-committees (attached)**

**Motion from the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee that Senate approve the proposed changes and wording to the committee duties and the addition of a committee quorum and the listing of the sub-committees.**

R. Worvill noted that in the new description of the committee duties, Convocation medals had been added and she asked whether this implied any change in practise.

S. Landry confirmed that this was no change to the present practise.

D. Holmberg asked whether this was a change to the committee mandate and whether it should therefore be a Notice of Motion and go first to the By-laws committee.

The Chair responded that it was felt that this was more of a clarification change than a Constitutional change.

MOTION CARRIED.

- b) **Notice of Nominees for Chair and Deputy Chair of Senate, from the Nominating committee**

A. Mitchell reported that a call for nominations had been circulated. The nominee for the Chair of Senate for 2016-17 was A. Kiefte and the nominee for the Deputy Chair of Senate 2016-2017 was R. Raeside. Nominations would remain open until the May meeting of Senate at which time additional nominations could be brought to the floor of Senate.

A. Mitchell stated that the Nominating committee would be looking for three additional faculty members to join Senate Executive, an Arts Faculty Senator to join the By-laws committee, a Lay Person to join Senate and a Faculty Elections Officer.

A. Mitchell noted that it was unclear whether the Faculty Elections Officer position needed to be a member of Senate or not. The By-laws committee had been asked to determine this.

- c) **Notice of Motions from the By-laws committee – standing committees changing to an ad-hoc status (attached)**

**Notice of Motions from the By-laws committee – standing committees changing to an ad-hoc status.**

D. Holmberg noted that R. Perrins would have been the best person to answer the questions that she wished to ask.

D. Holmberg asked about the Admissions and Academic Standing committee (Appeals) because she understood that the committee currently met on one day of the year in May, in order to hear all of the appeals from students. If that was the case, it would be problematic to turn it into an Ad-hoc committee because it would be difficult for the Chair of Senate to find people to be members on the committee.

F. Thompson was a member of the committee and agreed that much of the work was carried out on one occasion in May/June, but that the committee also met at other times if necessary. If there were no appeals in any given year, the committee would not have to meet at all.

B. Anderson noted that she had been a member of the By-laws committee at the time that the information was gathered. Many of the recommendations had been suggested by the sub-committee Chairs and R. Perrins felt strongly that this was the best approach for the A&AS (Appeals) committee.

P. Abela also felt that it would be good to ask R. Perrins to explain the thinking behind this change. If this became an ad-hoc committee it would only come into force at the discretion of the VP Academic and this could end up structurally changing the relationship between that process and Senate.

P. Williams pointed out that at present there is a process that goes first to the VP Academic and that if that cannot be resolved, it will go on to the Admissions and Academic Standing (Appeals) committee. Turning the committee into an ad-hoc would therefore make no difference to the process.

J. MacLeod stated that Senate was now debating the motion and what the process was. This was only a Notice of Motion.

The Chair agreed and felt that D. Holmberg had wanted to raise questions for the consideration of the By-laws committee, should they decide to make changes to the motion before bringing it back to Senate.

D. Holmberg also pointed out that the Chair of the committee used to be the VP Academic and had now been changed to be the Chair of Senate. This was a substantive change and it would be good to hear from R. Perrins on this change.

The Chair noted that these were points of consideration for the By-laws committee to consider around these motions prior to bringing them forward to Senate.

H. Wyle stated that both of these notices of motion were about putting language into the By-laws to put into effect the decision that had already been made by Senate last year; to transform two standing committees into two ad-hoc committees. H. Wyle deliberated with R. Perrins and The Chair of Senate during the process of drafting the language. There was a chain of reasoning behind having the Chair of Senate become the Chair of the ad-hoc committees but H. Wyle agreed to take all of the feedback under advisement and revisit how the By-laws committee had arrived at that recommendation.

**d) Motion from the By-laws committee  
(attached)**

**Motion to amend the By-laws of Senate, beginning in the 2016-17 academic year, to replace the description of the current Senate Curriculum Committee with the descriptions of the two committees below:**

*[Note concerning transition of membership: Continuing members on the Curriculum Committee will complete their current terms on either of the two committees. It was recognised that the staggering of terms will be decided when it is known who will continue from the 2015-16 committee.]*

**Curriculum Committee (Administrative)**

i. The membership of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:

- Registrar† (non-voting, *ex officio*)
- University Librarian or delegate (voting)
- two members from the Faculty of Arts
- two members from the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
- two members from the Faculty of Professional Studies
- one member from the Faculty of Theology
- one student
- the chair† of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) committee.

ii). The duties of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) shall be:

- 1) to oversee and co-ordinate all proposed changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 2) to identify issues arising as a result of recommended changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, and to forward issues to relevant bodies for consideration and action.
- 3) to consider all changes in undergraduate courses from all departments or schools, or from any individual concerning changes in the curriculum, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 4) to collaborate with the Registrar's office to produce the programs of study and course listings sections of the annual Calendar.
- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

and

#### Curriculum Committee (Policy)

i. The membership of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:

- Registrar† (non-voting, *ex officio*)
- University Librarian or delegate (voting)
- one member\* from the Faculty of Arts
- one member\* from the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
- one member\* from the Faculty of Professional Studies
- one member from the Faculty of Theology
- one student
- the chair† of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) committee.

\* one of the members from the Faculties of Arts, Pure and Applied Science and Professional Studies is designated as having specific responsibility for IDST issues, on a rotating basis.

† the members so-marked are members of both committees

ii. The duties of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) shall be:

- 1) to investigate innovative and alternative methods of provision of undergraduate curriculum.

*Rationale: this ensures the committee is forward-thinking and proactive in its role.*

- 2) to develop policies to ensure that undergraduate curriculum is consistently provided and administered across faculties.

*Rationale: this ensures the Policy committee will take the initiative in the development of curriculum policies.*

- 3) to ensure that the implementation of policies for undergraduate curriculum is managed, evaluated, revised and disseminated in a coherent and coordinated fashion.

*Rationale: this provides for the on-going improvement of curriculum policies.*

- 4) to collaborate with the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) to ensure the maintenance of an appropriate structure for the consideration of curricular changes.

*Rationale: this provides advice and recommendations concerning the procedures used in the consideration of curriculum.*

- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

**Motion moved by J. MacLeod, seconded by H. Wyle.**

A. Quema stated that this motion had been discussed by the Faculty of Arts Steering committee with regard to the membership. She noted that in the past the Chair of the committee was voted and decided upon by the members of the committee and she felt that the current wording was ambiguous. A. Quema asked for the description to explain that the Chair would be a member of the Curriculum committee, noting that there was a recurring formula through the By-laws of Senate, specifying that this was the case.

R. Raeside explained that the current motion had been provided by the Curriculum committee and had been amended by the By-laws committee, but that there had not been any discussion of a change to the way in which the Chair was appointed. If a formula existed it would be useful to insert the wording for both committees.

D. Holmberg suggested that the Chair position on each of the two committees should be ex-officio to make it obvious that whoever was the elected Chair on each committee would in fact also sit on the other committee.

S. Hewitt asked whether an ex-officio member could vote.

D. Holmberg confirmed that this did not affect the ability to vote. Ex-officio merely meant that by virtue of a person's office they were on the committee.

P. Williams asked about the duties of the Curriculum committee (Policy) and noted that under the other Curriculum committee (Administrative) several of the duties listed ended with the qualifier '*to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes*', whereas this qualifier did not appear anywhere in the description of the duties of the Curriculum committee (Policy). Without this wording P. Williams felt that Senate was mandating the committee to develop policies without bringing recommendations to Senate for approval.

**Motion that the following wording be added to the duties of the Curriculum committee (Policy) under Item #1, 2 and 3: ... and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such methods (in Item 1), policies (in Item 2) and (in Item 3) such implementations.**

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

**Motion that at the end of the list of committee members on the Curriculum committee (Administrative) and the Curriculum committee (Policy), the following statement be added: The Chair of this committee shall be elected from one of the faculty members.**

**Moved by A. Quema, seconded by P. Abela.**

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

D. Holmberg asked why the Curriculum committee (Policy) would have only one member from each Faculty whereas the Curriculum committee (Administrative) would have two members.

R. Raeside responded that the Curriculum and the By-laws committee had discussed this issue and it was felt that with two members from each Faculty on the committee there was a good chance that at least one from each Faculty would be present at meetings. Committees were easier to schedule if they were smaller, but it was very important to have full representation from the Faculties and in the case of curriculum matters the faculty members would understand how the process worked, having seen it pass through their Faculty Council meetings.

R. Raeside also noted that there was great diversity from the Faculties and that by having two representatives from each Faculty there would be a greater understanding of the way in which curriculum changes were handled across the university.

A. Quema stressed that the Curriculum committee (Administrative) needed to have two members from each Faculty because of the pure volume of work that was covered by this committee.

A. Quema questioned the implications of having both Chairs attend each other's committee meeting. This could prove problematical during certain points in the Calendar cycle because one committee might find itself extremely busy. This should not prevent either committee from continuing with their work.

**Motion to amend the previous amendment under the Curriculum committee (Policy) Item ii) 3) changing the wording to read "to ensure that the implementation of Senate approved policies for undergraduate curriculum is managed, revised, evaluated and disseminated in a coherent and coordinated fashion.**

**Moved by A. Kiefte, seconded by P. Williams.**

A. Quema was concerned that the word 'revised' could in fact be a major revision of the way in which things were implemented.

A. Kiefte responded that Item 2 had more to do with editing and developing policies and would therefore be reported to Senate.

J. MacLeod felt that this description fell under the Curriculum committee (Administration).

H. Wylie addressed J. MacLeod's concerns and noted that the By-laws committee had discussed this with the Curriculum committee. He stated that this was about a meta level of curriculum consideration. This ensured that the implementation of the policies were done coherently. It would monitor what the Administrative committee was doing and make sure that everything was being done properly. This committee would take on initiatives that the Curriculum committee (Administrative) did not have time to work on.

H. Wylie felt that the wording in Item ii) i) could also be altered.

A. Quema did not feel that this was necessary.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT CARRIED.

**Motion that the words ex-officio be added after the words 'the chair of the Curriculum committee (Policy) committee' and also after the words 'the chair of the Curriculum committee (Administrative) committee'.**

**Moved by D. Holmberg, seconded by J. MacLeod.**

D. Holmberg provided rationale for this amendment. When she first looked at the description of the committee membership, she thought that the Chair of the Curriculum committee (Policy) was a separate person rather than someone who was a part of the committee, and who would be elected by the committee members. The wording 'ex-officio' meant that whoever was the chair of the other committee would automatically sit on this committee.

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

A. Quema asked when the Curriculum committee (Policy) would start to operate.

R. Raeside pointed out that the start of the motion stated that the committee would become operational at the start of the 2016-2017 academic year.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED AS AMENDED.

The amended main motion now read as follows:

**Motion to amend the By-laws of Senate, beginning in the 2016-17 academic year, to replace the description of the current Senate Curriculum Committee with the descriptions of the two committees below:**

*[Note concerning transition of membership: Continuing members on the Curriculum Committee will complete their current terms on either of the two committees. It was recognised that the staggering of terms will*

*be decided when it is known who will continue from the 2015-16 committee.]*

**Curriculum Committee (Administrative)**

- ii. The membership of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:
- Registrar† (non-voting, *ex officio*)
  - University Librarian or delegate (voting)
  - two members from the Faculty of Arts
  - two members from the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
  - two members from the Faculty of Professional Studies
  - one member from the Faculty of Theology
  - one student
  - the chair† of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) committee (*ex-officio*)

The Chair of this committee shall be elected from one of the faculty members

ii). The duties of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) shall be:

- 1) to oversee and co-ordinate all proposed changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 2) to identify issues arising as a result of recommended changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, and to forward issues to relevant bodies for consideration and action.
- 3) to consider all changes in undergraduate courses from all departments or schools, or from any individual concerning changes in the curriculum, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 4) to collaborate with the Registrar's office to produce the programs of study and course listings sections of the annual Calendar.
- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

and

**Curriculum Committee (Policy)**

i. The membership of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:

- Registrar† (non-voting, *ex officio*)
- University Librarian or delegate (voting)
- one member\* from the Faculty of Arts
- one member\* from the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
- one member\* from the Faculty of Professional Studies



- one member from the Faculty of Theology
- one student
- the chair† of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) committee (*ex-officio*)

The Chair of this committee shall be elected from one of the faculty members.

\* one of the members from the Faculties of Arts, Pure and Applied Science and Professional Studies is designated as having specific responsibility for IDST issues, on a rotating basis.

† the members so-marked are members of both committees

ii. The duties of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) shall be:

- 1) to investigate innovative and alternative methods of provision of undergraduate curriculum, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such methods.

*Rationale: this ensures the committee is forward-thinking and proactive in its role.*

- 2) to develop policies to ensure that undergraduate curriculum is consistently provided and administered across faculties and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such policies.

*Rationale: this ensures the Policy committee will take the initiative in the development of curriculum policies.*

- 3) to ensure that the implementation of Senate approved policies for undergraduate curriculum is managed, revised, evaluated and disseminated in a coherent and coordinated fashion.

*Rationale: this provides for the on-going improvement of curriculum policies.*

- 4) to collaborate with the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) to ensure the maintenance of an appropriate structure for the consideration of curricular changes.

*Rationale: this provides advice and recommendations concerning the procedures used in the consideration of curriculum.*

- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

e) Motion to Senate re: Academic Regalia for Ph.D. Degrees at Acadia University

MOTION to Senate that whereas Acadia University will be graduating doctoral students from its School of Education, and that such graduates will require appropriate academic regalia that reflect the University's historic colours,

Be it resolved that the academic regalia for earned doctoral degrees at Acadia University be a navy blue robe, a red garnet velvet hood that will be lined with white satin and navy blue satin piping, and a navy blue velvet befeater hat with red garnet strand and tassel.

Moved by L. Aylward and seconded by H. Hemming.

P. Williams asked why the hat would be a befeater rather than a mortar board hat.

R. Raeside responded that mortar boards were generally used for an undergraduate degree and that other styles would be used for graduate degrees.

J. Hennessy asked whether the same regalia would be used for the Doctor of Divinity degree since the motion just mentioned doctoral degrees.

R. Raeside stated that this regalia was intended for the Ph.D.

L. Aylward noted that the Pd.D. in Education was the only one offered at present.

The Chair noted that it was not the only doctorate that Acadia awarded.

D. Benoit felt that this set the standard for all Ph.D.'s to be offered at Acadia in the future.

J. MacLeod felt that the word 'Ph.D.' should be added in place of 'earned doctoral' degrees.

A. Kieft questioned the consistency that existed between the Divinity College and other parts of the University with regard to other regalia.

R. Raeside stated that for the D. Min. degree it was a red robe with navy blue chevrons. The Masters degrees use black robes with mortar boards and the hoods vary according to colour. The Ph.D. degree used the same robe no matter what the discipline would be. This was the normal approach at Canadian universities. R. Raeside noted that American universities would often have different colours in the hoods, but that the British and Canadian universities the same colour would be used for all Ph.D. degrees. He also noted that the Ph.D. degree robe would be different from the D. Min. or D. Phil degree.

J. Hennessy asked what this meant and how it affected all of the current doctoral degrees. He felt that the motion as it was currently worded meant that no matter what Doctoral degree or Ph.D. degree was being earned, the regalia would all be the same.

R. Raeside stated that this regalia was only intended for the Ph.D. degree from the Education program. He agreed to alter the wording of the original motion as shown below:

**Motion that the original motion be changed to read: MOTION to Senate that whereas Acadia University will be graduating doctoral students from its School of Education, and that such graduates will require appropriate academic regalia that reflect the University's historic colours,**

**Be it resolved that the academic regalia for Ph.D. degrees at Acadia University be a navy blue robe, a red garnet velvet hood that will be lined with white satin and navy blue satin piping, and a navy blue velvet befeater hat with red garnet strand and tassel.**

**Moved by R. Raeside and seconded by J. Banks.**

R. Raeside stated that removing the word 'earned' would separate this from the Honorary Degrees.

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

C. Rushton noted that the inside of the hood could be degree specific and asked which colour designated Education.

R. Raeside stated that usually the Ph.D. degrees across the board would be the same colour with no distinction by program.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED WITH AMENDMENTS.

f) **Motion from the Faculty of Professional Studies regarding changes to the FPS Constitution (*attached*)**

**Motion from the Faculty of Professional Studies regarding changes to the FPS Constitution. Moved by H. Hemming and seconded by J. MacLeod.**

D. Holmberg asked about the Associate Members section on Page 2 where AEC was identified and asked if this was the correct name.

Ian Hutchinson agreed that AEC was correct, for the Acadia Entrepreneurship Centre.

D. Holmberg asked about Section XI Senate Representation on Page 7 and asked how the members from each unit were elected.

H. Hemming explained the current process.

D. Holmberg suggested that the wording be altered to read:

'(c) one member elected from each School/Department in the Faculty of Professional Studies by the members of that School/Department, and one member at large elected by the Faculty of Professional Studies.'

H. Hemming agreed to take the change under advisement.

P. Williams noted that under the Associate Members section on Page 2 representatives from the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science had a voice but no vote. He asked about the reason for this and noted that faculty reps on the FPAS Council did have a vote.

H. Hemming stated that this was not an amendment and stated that this wording had been in place for many years.

F. Thompson pointed out that on Page 6, Section F 'The Distinguished Teaching Award Committee currently listed the ASU VP Academic as one of the members of the selection committee. She requested a change of ASU Officer on that committee.

F. Thompson also requested that 'Acadia Student Union' be corrected to read 'Acadia Students' Union'.

**Motion that the ASU VP Academic should be replaced by the ASU Senator for the FPS because that person would be a student in the**

**Faculty of Professional Studies and would have more familiarity with the Faculty. Moved by F. Thompson, seconded by D. Benoit.**

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

J. Hennessy pointed out that on the Faculty of Arts Council the other Faculty reps had a voice but no vote.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED AS AMENDED.

g) **Motion from the Academic Planning Committee that Senate approve principles emerging from the identified themes (*previously circulated*)**

**Motion that whereas Senate embarked on a “Big Picture” Discussion in December 2015, and whereas the Academic Planning Committee was directed by Senate to identify emergent themes from that discussion, and subsequently principles based on the discussion and ensuing debate in Senate, the Academic Planning Committee moves that the following principles be adopted by Senate:**

**1. Senate reaffirms the definition of an Acadia Education, passed at Senate April 2013, i.e.,**

***An Acadia education:***

***1. Is rigorous and liberal and requires students to gain knowledge and understanding within and across disciplines.***

***2. Focuses on the whole student and fosters healthy academic, social, and residential experiences to develop well-rounded critical thinkers, engaged citizens, and lifelong learners.***

**2. Acadia believes that opportunities for flexibility and choice in rigorous student learning should be enhanced.**

**3. Acadia continues to support the broader integration of the academic sector.**

**4. Acadia’s educational environment promotes engagement and critical analysis in our graduates as they enter the broader world.**

**5. Acadia believes in supporting community connections and engagement as part of the university experience.**

**6. Acadia believes in engaging our students with research.**

**Moved by J. Hennessy and seconded by P. Williams.**

L. Aylward felt that there was an overuse of the words ‘engaged, engaging and engagement’.

G. Phillips asked whether each item should read ‘Senate’ as opposed to ‘Acadia’ since Item #1 began with ‘Senate’.

P. Williams stated that Senate had been charged with defining the academic mission and direction of the University and he felt that the use of the word ‘Acadia’ was acceptable in this context.

H. Wylie requested clarification around the use of the word ‘integration’ in Item #3 since integration could mean a number of things including *merging*.

J. Hennessy stated that the APC attached no particular meaning to the word and was merely reporting back to Senate. He asked that any Senators that had been in favour of greater integration, to speak to that point now.

P. Williams noted that based on some of the comments that were used to support Item #3 the meaning would be more collaboration, more inter-disciplinary offerings and a desire to make it easier for students to move through their degrees. He noted that if it was the will of Senate it could involve merging of programs.

L. Aylward asked what would now happen to the document.

The Chair reminded L. Aylward that in March Senate asked the APC to take the themes that had been identified and frame them into principles, then bring them forward to Senate to approve.

P. Williams pointed out that a response to Question #2 would also be brought to Senate by the APC and that at that point Senate would need to decide which areas it was interested in pursuing, also determining which Senate sub-committee would be asked to help Senate to develop that initiative.

R. Worvill asked about Item #2. She understood that the ideas for flexibility and choice in the original PowerPoint presentation were related to being multi and inter-disciplinary. She wondered whether the current statement could be seen to be an escape clause relating to Item #1. This was because in #1 the definition of an Acadia Education stated that it *'is rigorous and liberal and requires students to gain knowledge and understanding within and across disciplines'*.

R. Worvill requested the following change to the wording of Item #2 to avoid any contradiction.

**Motion that Item #2 read 'Acadia believes that opportunities for flexibility and choice in rigorous student learning within the liberal education framework should be enhanced'. Moved by R. Worvill and seconded by E. Patterson.**

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

G. Gibson noted that the original PPT had specific language about the 21<sup>st</sup> Century ideas and she liked that language because it spoke to equity and to being engaged in the broader world.

P. Williams noted that this language had been removed because some Senators had not liked it.

L. Aylward stated that this language was used a lot in educational research and literature around the use of technology which could then tie Acadia to a branding of a kind of teaching/learning environment that might not be what was intended in the PPT document. She felt it a mistake for Acadia to attach itself to current lingo.

A. Quema was not concerned about the use of '21<sup>st</sup> Century' in the language in Item #4. The PPT originally referred to diversity and included the aboriginal community, African Canadian and indigenous students. A. Quema noted that this was not captured in Item #4 but requested that it be amended to allow for

inviting people in and addressing certain concerns such as the Truth and Reconciliation Agreements.

A. Kiefte proposed the following wording change for Item #4: 'Acadia's educational environment promotes engagement, awareness of current societal concerns, and critical analysis skills in our graduates as they enter the broader world'.

The Chair asked whether this amendment was in aid of addressing the concerns raised by R. Worvill and A. Quema.

A. Kiefte felt that the spirit of some of the comments regarding equity that had been raised at the last meeting would now be captured. By using words such as 'current societal concerns' Acadia would not be limited to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century language but would still capture the broad element around equity and diversity.

A. Quema suggested that the word 'societal' was too broad and that it would be better to use specific words such as equity and diversity. The wording for Item #4 would now read 'Acadia's educational environment promotes engagement, awareness of current equity and diversity concerns, and critical analysis in our graduates as they enter the broader world'.

D. Holmberg requested that the word 'should' be inserted and that Item #4 now read: 'Acadia's educational environment should promote engagement, awareness of current equity and diversity concerns, and critical analysis in our graduates as they enter the broader world'.

A. Kiefte requested that the word 'shall' replace 'should'.

The Chair pointed out that the word 'shall' would be unnecessary since the original statement meant that anyway.

B. Robinson asked whether the word 'issues' might be more applicable than the word 'concerns'.

A. Quema suggested removing the word 'should' or 'shall' which would be consistent with the wording in the other items which was all in the present tense. A. Kiefte agreed.

P. Williams preferred to go back to 'societal concerns' because he felt that equity and diversity were contained within that wording along with many other things. This would allow for an education that was fully embedded in societal concerns.

Barb Anderson suggesting a different approach by adding the wording 'societal concerns including equity and diversity' because sometimes it was necessary to single out areas where attention was needed.

The Chair read the sum of the amendments: **'Acadia's educational environment promotes engagement, awareness of current societal concerns including equity and diversity, and critical analysis in our graduates as they enter the broader world'.**

AMENDMENT APPROVED.

The Chair asked for comments or further discussion of the main motion.

There were none.

The Chair reminded Senators that the way to end debate on any topic was not by calling “Question” although this did happen frequently at Senate. There was a procedure to end debate which involved a particular motion.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED AS AMENDED.

P. Williams asked whether Senate could continue its practise of calling ‘Question’ to avoid more motions.

D. Benoit noted cases at Senate where Senators had been trying to get on the speakers list and others were calling for an end to the discussion. He noted that it was important for Senators asking to get on the speakers list, to be allowed to do so. D. Benoit did not have a problem with calling ‘Question’ and thereby pushing a motion, as long as everyone had an opportunity to speak.

The Chair agreed that this was the spirit behind her comments and noted that if ‘Question’ was called, she would still ask whether everyone had had an opportunity to speak.

A. Quema asked what the next stage of the process was, now that principles had been established. She noted that President Ivany had been of the opinion that once the principles had been agreed upon, Senate would work on implementing and carrying out those principles.

P. William responded that Question #2 covered what steps should be taken to achieve these principles and noted that the APC would bring a set of suggestions to Senate for approval, at which point the work would be moved out to the various Senate sub-committees.

A. Quema asked whether the tasks would be delegated to the sub-committees by June to be worked on these during the summer.

P. Williams agreed that this was the case.

**5) Carried over from March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016 Senate meeting**

**a) Senate member vacancy on the Senate Nominating committee (*Registrar*)**

J. Banks explained that no nomination had been received and he asked for nominations from the floor of Senate.

There were no nominations.

J. Banks stated that A. Mitchell had agreed to re-offer and thanked him for agreeing to continue.

**Motion to adjourn at 5:40 p.m. Moved by D. Benoit.**

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

---

R. Hare, Recording Secretary



The duties have not been updated in a number of years so we would like to update as per the proposed wording below (see updates in red).

We have also added a quorum and have listed the sub-committees as these have not been previously listed (also in red).

**Motion that Senate approve the proposed changes in wording to the committee duties and the addition of a committee quorum and the listing of the sub-committees**

**CURRENT WORDING**

Committee: Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee

Type: Standing

Status: Active

Duties:

- (1) To decide policy and process by which winner 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) Periodically to 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.

**PROPOSED WORDING**

Committee: Scholarships, Prizes and Awards Committee

Type: Standing

Status: Active

Duties:

- (1) To decide policy and process by which recipients of scholarships, prizes, bursaries, scholar-bursaries, awards, and convocation medals are to be selected and to gather all information it considers necessary for the selection;
- (2) To select the recipients of undergraduate entrance scholarships, prizes, and awards and some in-course scholarships, prizes, and awards;
- (3) To periodically review 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;
- (5) To consider such other matters as the Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

Quorum: 6 with at least 1 member from each faculty

Sub-Committees:

- (1) Bursary and Loan Committee
  - 1 Registrar or Delegate
  - 1 Financial Aid Counselor
  - 1 Manager of Student Accounts
  - 1 ASU VP Academic
  - 1 SPAC faculty member and alternate (faculty member)
- (2) Awards and Appeals Committee
  - 1 Registrar or Delegate
  - 1 Financial Aid Counselor

1 Chair of SPAC

1 SPAC faculty member in different faculty than Chair

Motion to amend the By-laws of Senate, beginning in the 2016-17 academic year, to replace the description of the current Senate Curriculum Committee with the descriptions of the two committees below:

*[Note concerning transition of membership: Continuing members on the Curriculum Committee will complete their current terms on either of the two committees. It was recognised that the staggering of terms will be decided when it is known who will continue from the 2015-16 committee.]*

#### Curriculum Committee (Administrative)

iii. The membership of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:

- Registrar† (non-voting, *ex officio*)
- University Librarian or delegate (voting)
- two members from the Faculty of Arts
- two members from the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
- two members from the Faculty of Professional Studies
- one member from the Faculty of Theology
- one student
- the chair† of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) committee (*ex-officio*)

The Chair of this committee shall be elected from among the faculty members

ii). The duties of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) shall be:

- 1) to oversee and co-ordinate all proposed changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 2) to identify issues arising as a result of recommended changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, and to forward issues to relevant bodies for consideration and action.
- 3) to consider all changes in undergraduate courses from all departments or schools, or from any individual concerning changes in the curriculum, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 4) to collaborate with the Registrar's office to produce the programs of study and course listings sections of the annual Calendar.
- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

and

#### Curriculum Committee (Policy)

i. The membership of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:

- Registrar† (non-voting, *ex officio*)
- University Librarian or delegate (voting)
- one member\* from the Faculty of Arts
- one member\* from the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
- one member\* from the Faculty of Professional Studies
- one member from the Faculty of Theology
- one student
- the chair† of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) committee (*ex-officio*)

The Chair of this committee shall be elected from among the faculty members.

\* one of the members from the Faculties of Arts, Pure and Applied Science and Professional Studies is designated as having specific responsibility for IDST issues, on a rotating basis.

† the members so-marked are members of both committees

ii. The duties of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) shall be:

- 1) to investigate innovative and alternative methods of provision of undergraduate curriculum, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such methods.
- 2) to develop policies to ensure that undergraduate curriculum is consistently provided and administered across faculties and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such policies.
- 3) to ensure that the implementation of Senate approved policies for undergraduate curriculum is managed, revised, evaluated and disseminated in a coherent and coordinated fashion.
- 4) to collaborate with the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) to ensure the maintenance of an appropriate structure for the consideration of curricular changes.
- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

**MOTION to Senate that whereas Acadia University will be graduating doctoral students from its School of Education, and that such graduates will require appropriate academic regalia that reflect the University's historic colours,**

**Be it resolved that the academic regalia for Ph.D. degrees at Acadia University be a navy blue robe, a red garnet velvet hood that will be lined with white satin and navy blue satin piping, and a navy blue velvet befeater hat with red garnet strand and tassel.**

**Motion to request that Senate approve the following changes to the Faculty of Professional Studies Constitution:**

The changes outlined in the FPS constitution for the most part reflect changes that result from the division of the School of Recreational Management and Kinesiology into the School of Kinesiology and the Department of Community Development. The only exception is described below. *Director* has been replaced by "*Director/Head*" and *School* has been replaced by "*School/Dept.*" "*ACSB*" has been replaced by the new title "*ACE*". On page 2 "...the three Librarians of FPS" has been changed to say "...*the Librarians of FPS.*"

The 2014 Faculty of Professional Studies **Award for Excellence in Teaching** Committee requested that the Dean/Directors/and Head review and suggest changes to the nature/criteria/application and selection process for the Award. The revision process was guided by criteria of the Association of Atlantic Universities Teaching Award to facilitate future nominations to the AAU.

Changes to the Constitution related to this award outlined below.

**Previous wording in the FPC Constitution was as follows:**

The Award for Excellence in Teaching Committee shall consist of six members:

- (a) three faculty members, one from each School, who have held full-time positions in the Faculty for a minimum of three years;
- (b) three students, one from each School, who are third or fourth year undergraduates, second year B.Ed. students, or graduate students.

The Committee shall be responsible for administering the selection process for the Award and reviewing and revising the selection criteria. Consideration should be given to the criteria specified for other internal and external teaching awards.

**New wording:**

The Distinguished Teaching Award Committee shall consist of seven members:

- (a) Dean of the Faculty of Professional Studies
- (b) Directors and Head from each School/Department in the FPS
- (c) Chair of the Senate Faculty Support Committee
- (d) Acadia Students Union FPS Student Senator

The Distinguished Teaching Award Committee will review all nominations, develop a short list of those worthy of the award, and from the short list determine the best candidate. The award will not necessarily be awarded every year.

## **Principles Emerging from the Senate Discussion**

Whereas Senate embarked on a “Big Picture” Discussion in December 2015, and whereas the Academic Planning Committee was directed by Senate to identify emergent themes from that discussion, and subsequently principles based on the discussion and ensuing debate in Senate, the Academic Planning Committee **moves** that the following principles be adopted by Senate:

1. Senate reaffirms the definition of an Acadia Education, passed at Senate April 2013, i.e.,  
*An Acadia education:*
  1. *Is rigorous and liberal and requires students to gain knowledge and understanding within and across disciplines.*
  2. *Focuses on the whole student and fosters healthy academic, social, and residential experiences to develop well-rounded critical thinkers, engaged citizens, and lifelong learners.*
2. Acadia believes that opportunities for flexibility and choice in rigorous student learning within the liberal education framework should be enhanced.
3. Acadia continues to support the broader integration of the academic sector.
4. Acadia’s educational environment promotes engagement, awareness of current societal issues including equity and diversity and critical analysis in our graduates as they enter the broader world.
5. Acadia believes in supporting community connections and engagement as part of the university experience.
6. Acadia believes in engaging our students with research.