

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 14th December, 2015

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 14th December, 2015 beginning at 3:30 p.m. with Chair R. Raeside presiding, 38 present and 4 guests.

1) Approval of Agenda

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

The Chair informed Senators that a minute of silence would be held after the agenda was approved to remember Dr. Linnea Veinotte and Dr. Sharon Roscoe.

There were no additions to the agenda.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA CARRIED.

Senators stood for a minute of silence.

2) Minutes of the Meeting of
9th November, 2015

Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday November 9th, 2015 as distributed. Moved by R. Worvill, seconded by B. Anderson.

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

D. MacKinnon requested that the wording in the following paragraphs be altered is shown below to reflect his comments regarding the Strategic Research Plan:

D. MacKinnon reported that he and a small group of research administrators had met recently with Gilles Patry – President of Canadian Foundation for Innovation – to discuss the future of CFI going forward. CFI will support the purchase of equipment across all Faculties.

D. MacKinnon noted that there were four theme areas identified in the Strategic Research Plan.

D. MacKinnon stated that in the past Acadia had been unsuccessful in SSHRC's aid to small university funding for a period of nine years until it narrowed a request for funding to

one very specific area, at which point it was successful in obtaining funding.

D. MacKinnon met with most Heads and Directors across the campus and asked what they thought of the idea of a plan that had a rural focus.

This represented an opportunity to do something different to increase a sense of community and strengthen our research culture.

D. MacKinnon responded that the committee had not really talked about priorities yet and that a strategy would be needed for those. D. MacKinnon felt that a first step would be to develop a repository of material that referred to rural and coastal.

P. Williams felt that most people around the Province lived in either a rural or coastal location.

D. MacKinnon expected that this would be up to the individual departments. He noted that when Acadia was hiring faculty departments were primarily looking at the courses that needed to be taught within departments.

H. Wylie requested that on Page 12, paragraph 7, “A. Quema felt that Senate could consider dealing with just the first question to and see how things went, possibly delaying discussing the second question until the January meeting of Senate” be changed to read “A. Quema felt that Senate could consider dealing with just the first question to see how things went, possibly delaying discussing the second question until the January meeting of Senate.

H. Wylie requested that on Page 12, paragraph 5, “The Chair agreed that the length of the Senate meeting could be lengthened if Senators were asked ahead of time” be changed to read “The Chair agreed that the Senate meeting could be lengthened if Senators were asked ahead of time.”

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS REVISED CARRIED.

3) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

Regrets were received from A. Vibert, R. Perrins, L. Aylward, R. Murphy, S. Mesheau, A. Quema, J. Yang, J. Cayford, R. Seale, J. Graham and R. Densmore. C. Visser and J. Hennessy would be arriving late.

The Chair welcomed S. Landry who would be replacing R. Murphy and mentioned that R. Seale would in future be replacing P. Rockwell. D. Duke and J. Hooper were welcomed from the Academic Planning Committee.

There were no objections and no other announcements at this time.

The Chair reported that an *ad hoc* sub-committee of Senate Executive had met on October 14th and November 2nd, 2015, to organise a process for “The Big Picture” discussions at the December Senate meeting.

4) New Business

a) **Motion that the Senate of Acadia University approves the 2015-2020 Strategic Research Plan.**

(Notice of Motion attached)

Motion that the Senate of Acadia University approves the 2015-2020 Strategic Research Plan. Moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by J. Colton.

D. MacKinnon noted that since the previous Senate meeting he had carried out some wordsmithing of the text in consultation with some units on campus. Any significant changes to the text had been provided as commentary underneath the 'Notice of Motion'.

R. Worvill noted that following distribution of the Strategic Research Plan she had received feedback from colleagues and noted that there were still concerns. While one concern about future hiring and future positions was likely to be put to rest by the correction to the minutes, a number of her colleagues worked in areas that they would have difficulty being classified under the four theme areas, and they were therefore concerned about distribution of internal research funds. They were also concerned that research projects continue to be assessed on their merit as research projects.

D. MacKinnon responded that these concerns had been raised during the November meeting of Senate and stated that he did not feel that there could be any impact on internal funding such as 25.55, unless in some given year the 25.55 committee decided on a certain priority.

MOTION APPROVED.

Senators expressed their appreciation to D. MacKinnon for negotiating the Strategic Research Plan through Senate.

b) Introduction to the 'Big Picture' discussion

The Chair highlighted documentation that had been attached to the agenda and asked G. Gibson to provide an overview of what the process would involve.

G. Gibson noted that since the idea of having small group discussions had first been raised, it had already resulted in a number of interesting discussions taking place in the *ad hoc* sub-committee of Senate Executive and by individual departments with interesting insights coming out of those discussions. G. Gibson provided some background and reminded Senators that in the spring there had been talk about the fact that substantial issues did not get onto the floor of Senate. In September Senate Executive identified some substantial issues and Senators were asked also to identify issues. Several years ago Senate was engaged in a forward planning process, much of which involved specifically having broad scale consultation among academic groups. G. Gibson pointed out that the long term trends in regional demographics and the regional economy made it vital that Acadia be thinking about what makes it distinctive.

G. Gibson drew Senators attention to the One Nova Scotia Coalition Action Plan which was available on-line and pointed out that there was one chapter on Universities and Colleges that was well worth referring to. G. Gibson

noted that although Acadia was already doing many of the things that were mentioned it would still be worthwhile considering whether there were better ways in which the curriculum could be developed that would open up opportunities if funding were to become available.

G. Gibson reminded Senators of the two questions:

- **What are the preeminent curriculum/academic program principles and priorities you want to see a future Acadia work toward and/or enact?**
- **Given our current strengths and resources, and given the current university context provincially and federally, how would you imagine operationalizing these principles and priorities? What supports /obstacles might you expect?**

G. Gibson expected that small group meetings would serve to kick start the discussion. Senate would be asked to consider a motion to suspend rule and accept the small group discussions, move into assigned groups in a number of different rooms in the BAC, and be assigned index cards and markers. Senators were asked to allocate five minutes writing down their own ideas before spending 20 minutes discussing all of the ideas as a small group. Once key points had been identified and recorded by the scribe for each group (by a member of the Academic Planning Committee), all Senators would return to BAC 132 and a time of two minutes per group would be allotted for the reporting of their key points. G. Gibson noted that although the APC member would serve as scribe and timekeeper for the group, another member of the group could report back to Senate if desired.

G. Gibson stated that the process would then be repeated in order to discuss question two. After that, Senate would come out of the ‘suspension of the rules’ and if there was remaining time a discussion of the main points that had emerged from the exercise would be held. The raw data would be compiled and distributed to all Senators once the individual groups had clearly identified the key points that they wanted to bring forward. Groups needed to agree on their raw data before it moved on to the Academic Planning Committee.

G. Gibson stated that at the regular Senate meeting on January 11th, 2016, the emergent themes would be discussed with the APC members present and it was expected that at the February meeting of Senate, the APC would bring back a full analysis of the themes. These identified themes would be forwarded to the relevant sub-committees for action.

G. Gibson identified the group’s membership.

Motion to accept the small group discussion process. Moved by P. Williams and seconded by M. Lukeman.

P. Abela noted that while he would be voting in favour of the motion, he remained concerned about the clock running out at the end of the Senate meeting, which would curtail the opportunity for broad discussion of the issues. If time did run out, P. Abela wanted assurance that Senate would continue a fulsome discussion during the January meeting of Senate.

P. Williams agreed that this was what would happen.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Chair welcomed President Ivany to the meeting and asked whether he had any announcements to be made.

President Ivany reported that there were two items, the first being the issue of the shift in the Canadian context, to the notion that bigger is better. He noted that this idea presented both a challenge and an opportunity for a university such as Acadia. In the case of the Canada First Research Excellence Funds (CFREF) which were the previous Government's largest investment in the research enterprise in Canada, it was highly likely that all of the money from the first round of funding would stay within the largest medical-doctoral category institutions in the country. President Ivany felt that there was a risk that primarily undergraduate universities such as Acadia with faculty conducting first-rate research which then informed their first-rate teaching, risked being classified as teaching only universities.

President Ivany felt that it was incumbent on Acadia to be able to define how in the contemporary PSE sector in Canada it was still possible to have an institution such as Acadia, with a strong expectation for research and strong research occurring, while also having undergraduate and graduate students involved in the research and the high engagement model that Acadia was known for. He felt that Acadia was acting as a counterpoint to the prevailing orthodoxy in higher education in Canada, and that some opportunities could come from that standpoint.

President Ivany's second point concerned the current round of MOU discussions with the Province. He noted that the funding piece has been hived off for additional work to be carried out during 2016-2017 and as a result would not be implemented until 2017-2018. This further delay was a disappointment.

Motion to suspend the rules. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by D. MacKinnon.

MOTION CARRIED.

Senators broke into small groups to discuss the two questions, returning after each discussion to report briefly on their findings.

When the Senators returned to BAC 132 the Chair asked either the scribe or another spokesperson for each group to report briefly on their discussion.

J. Hennessy reported that the main points from his group were:

- A core program to be maintained and a diversity of programs across the campus
- A common core for students across campus
- Investigate the idea of declaring a major later in the program
- Increased cross collaboration between departments

- Maintain quantity and quality of undergraduate research
- Develop primary areas of relevance to the 21st Century
- Maintain small classes and hands-on experience
- Give all students some foundation across the disciplines in Arts and Sciences.

D. Benoit reported that the main points from his group were:

- Maintain good reputation and continue to be well rounded
- Stick to the core values and determine what that means for Acadia
- Cherish small liberal education experience and close faculty/student relationship which may mean limiting programs from becoming too large
- Increase connections across campus
- Focus on students and community
- Keep breadth in the programs and don't make the mistake of focussing exclusively on training students to participate in the economy. Students will participate in the civil society and will need to be more well-rounded.
- Live up to the ideals of what a university truly is.
- Look at how Acadia can follow up on the Truth and Reconciliation agreement and its relationship with the Aboriginal community.
- Full integration of Arts and Sciences
- Need to commit to a high quality of limited graduate education as some small schools in the States also do.
- Focus on the principles of the new Strategic Research Plan.

P. Williams reported that the main points from his group were:

- The need to have a more integrated academic sector because the current structure makes it more difficult for students to move around and across programs
- Is the programming relevant at Acadia? Could some programming be kept but also vary the delivery models
- Diversity of the student body: could there be more Aboriginal students and more African Nova Scotian students
- Engage with the external world but be sure to maintain our academic integrity and not let external factors have undue influence on the internal operations.

C. Rushton reported that the main points from her group were:

- To support and continue to support Liberal Education but one that is clearly defined
- Collaboration and learning across units, including the Library and all support services
- Operationalizing student-centered curriculum
- Community engagement and a commitment to it through service learning.

J. Colton reported that the main points from his group were:

- Importance of tenure stream faculty and librarians supporting the

experiences of the students

- Highlighting, celebrating undergraduate research
- Greater collaboration amongst students and faculty
- Co-curricular transcript style requirements; innovative program options like the Connections program
- Importance of continuing to focus on critical thinking skills
- Maintain and support the ideas of a global university environment and live up to what we say that we are in terms of small classes and close personal interactions amongst students and faculty.

M. Lukeman reported that the main points from his group were:

- Maintain departments as a focus of strength which would require some additional support and resourcing and that a similar comment applied to the Library in that adding resources could help to distinguish Acadia.
- Have a fulsome discussion about what 'liberal arts' really meant, and whether the University was living up to that definition
- Need to forge greater connections with the public and could have people employed to encourage those connections
- Focus of education needs to be to help students to become global citizens rather than workers
- New directions should be identified that capitalize on our current capabilities; a good example being the Women's and Gender Studies program.

D. Duke reported that the main points from his group were:

- Train students to be resilient with integrity as a cornerstone of their studies
- Ensure that graduates are open to other perspectives which they would experience either in a formal academic sense through exposure to other cultures in the academic environment, or informally through the maintenance and expansion of the environment that celebrates diversity
- Research opportunities for undergraduates are key because they provide the environment by which students can develop tools of self-reliance and resiliency while also knowing that they are engaged in activities that make a difference.
- A careful balance needs to be struck between the foundation created by disciplinary specialization and the opportunities afforded by multiple perspectives through inter-disciplinarity
- STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math) vs STEM should become the model and students should be exposed to all five areas. Finding this balance would be key to who we are in 10 years' time
- Timetabling needs to be examined to create greater flexibility for students. This could happen within the existing two term framework or the University could look at the Spring/Summer expansion to allow students to complete their program in three years for example.

F. Thompson reported that the main points from her group were:

- They began a discussion of the 'liberal arts' and then moved into a discussion about 'liberal learning' because they wanted to look at what the ideal Acadia graduate and Acadia student would look like
- Nothing should be limited by the computer systems at Acadia in terms of the professor's ability to teach
- There needs to be a commitment to a culture of dialogue and the need to look at opportunities across curricula and across departments and disciplines
- Important to focus on the principles and discuss different ways in which students should be able to move between programs to get a well-rounded education.

The Chair asked if this was an accurate record of the small group discussions.

There were no objections and the Senators moved into small groups again to discuss the second question, at 4:50 p.m.

A. Kiefte arrived.

The Chair asked the groups to report back in reverse order from the first question.

F. Thompson reported that the main points from her group were:

- Importance of agreeing on a vision for Acadia
- A lack of trust between departments and colleagues can prove limiting
- Build bridges between disciplines either by maximising what is available on campus or talking outside of the bargaining table to discuss different pedagogy.

D. Duke reported that the main points from his group were:

- Focus on the structure of the degree in terms of core vs breadth. Could look at other things such as the number of hours needed in class to gain a credit, more creative learning models such as the politics passport, inter-disciplinary courses that are tailored to majors from different programs, also 'team talk' would be another option.
- Students could become leaders in the area of resourcing if they are provided with the tools. Students can be active participants in ways that generate research in new learning environments and community engagement such as SMILE, Kinderskills, Active Aging, CODE programs, cultural engagement in the School of Music. It would be important to create an environment whereby faculty and students could participate meaningfully
- Zeroing in on the Academic All Canadian philosophy that demonstrates how programs and attitudes or environments can be created quite rapidly and how philosophies can change quite dramatically in a short period of time. Other examples of this would be the student mentorship program and the Bio-buddyprogram which mentors introductory students. Senior student perspectives need to be operationalized for the incoming students
- Students should be required to be exposed in a real and meaningful

way to perspectives of units outside of their own units

- Opportunities afforded by the U-4 model need to be explored.

M. Lukeman reported that the main points from his group were:

- Agreement that many problems could be solved if the University had some money
- Discussion of what needed to take place in order to make that happen
- Focus some of the answers to question1 (cluster them) so that there would be a united idea as a university that could then be put forward. A united vision would make it easier for people with money to support and get behind. This would include collectively speaking with the Province, the community and the Advancement Office.
- Rather than fighting with sister organizations over a piece of the existing pie, it would be more successful to collectively lobby the Government

J. Hooper reported that the main points from his group were:

- Focus internally and take the time to figure out the various obstacles to innovation and to other ideas
- Concern about other ways to support research funding and making sure that student research was being showcased
- Looking at case studies of both successful and failed attempts at innovation in order to deconstruct and then understand how Acadia could make things work better
- Developing a framework to support innovative options for learning. It was felt that Acadia already does some of these things very well but this would take things to the next level
- Look at ways to create a five year Bachelor/Master's program.

B. Anderson reported that the main points from her group were:

- The importance of common definitions as the University steps into operationalizing goals and priorities particularly if a liberal education is what Acadia wants, as opposed to a liberal arts education
- A common definition of community engagement is important particularly if Acadia is going to support ongoing faculty and students. This means working to support the empowerment of those in the community as well as students as things move forward
- The timetable and curriculum needed to be sculpted around both the content and the delivery. This could be a common experience, a common core, a set of courses within a given set of themes, how to be a university student 101 that would be offered on writing and reflection, or co-teaching
- The Learning Commons model as a virtual or an actual place might be something to re-consider
- Effective processes to be in place to allow for change
- Fear about change and pushback to change was one obstacle which the University needs to get beyond
- A lot could be done without money.

P. Williams reported that the main points from his group were:

- Facilitating different methods of teaching courses: team teaching, alternative delivery modes etc.
- Cross appointments
- Grouping of courses in different ways
- The role of technology and how responsible faculty are to make sure that technology is used effectively and appropriately. What are the ethical uses of technology and what are the responsibilities?
- Need to have a good look at sculpting approaches to timetabling and scheduling as one of the barriers to some of these things
- Ability to do or not do things in the student information system and some policies that impeded faculty's attempts to do things in the classroom.

D. Benoit reported that the main points from his group were:

- Possibility of creating new degrees with existing resources and also using those resources more effectively by merging generic courses together with departmental cooperation in order to make that happen. This hinges on changing the way that we measure programs and units and graduates on campus.
- Thinking about the good of the University as a whole and what the best decisions would be means not just considering FCE numbers. It would be important to change the way in which we measure our units and our programs and the way that they work
- Operationalizing what we mean by a liberal education and developing a central core for students to take.
- Take advantage of co-curricular opportunities and promoting the whole university experience. Making sure that when students are on campus the programs offered were actually doable and that students could take advantage of activities outside of the classroom
- When making hard academic choices focus on collegiality when doing so and then share the reasons and rationale behind those decisions, especially when this comes to complement.
- Look for ways to hire aboriginal faculty and to incorporate their indigenous knowledge into the curriculum
- Receive responses to the Strategic Research Plan and see what the various units think and how they might work with the new plan
- Develop much more private funding and get greater cooperation internationally
- Deepen our relationships with sister institutions

J. Hennessy reported that the main points from his group were:

- Opportunity in the B.Sc./B.A. review to consider those structures since half of the students will be implicated in that review
- Desire to increase the availability of free electives in those degrees – an obstacle to this being that departments would have to be willing to give up some course requirements. Also the fact that students tend to be conservative in their thinking about what a university education should be
- Faculty could become more aware of different course opportunities across the campus through professional development sessions, in

order to be able to advise students more effectively and to know what other faculty were doing in different courses

- Limitations on course opportunities for students due to Major first year and pre-requisite course restrictions
- Science intro courses could be rotated by theme areas or having more sections of science intro courses with different focusses that would accommodate different types of students and allow classes to be smaller
- Obstacle to inter-disciplinarity is that it needs to be recognized during the career development process in some way
- Research sector model is an opportunity for connecting departments involved in research and teaching, but is also an opportunity for reaching out to the community. Opportunity to reach out to the media to recognize Acadia as a source of experts and to celebrate the research expertise that we have here
- Targeting college students that could come to Acadia to complete their degrees and have more defined transfer agreements with various institutions.

The Chair asked whether any points had been missed.

Motion to return to Robert's Rules. Moved by D. Benoit, seconded by R. Williams.

MOTION CARRIED.

P. Abela discussed the cumulative effect of technology over the years at Acadia and felt that if technology was to be looked at as one of the ways of ramping up offerings, it would be important to consider it in ways that engaged a cumulative benefit to the technology.

P. Williams clarified that comments about technology referred more to a recognition that technology was deeply entrenched, in that all students come to class with computers. P. Williams stated that his group discussed what the role of technology was in modern society, and the appropriate use for technology in areas such as digital literacy and social media.

B. Anderson noted that there was plenty of commonality between the group discussions. Many of the comments were similar to previous conversations held in different units and she noted that this represented an interesting opportunity to uncover some of what was being discussed in units. B. Anderson thanked G. Gibson and the Senate Executive for bringing this issue forward and felt that it was a good example of a process that Senate could use in the future to spark some innovation.

President Ivany had been able to listen in to various groups and was struck by the desire to focus on a set of core values or definitions that needed to be got right. Concentric circles spread out from that central theme that addressed implementation or were more specific to individual departments. It would be necessary to establish at Senate a direction to move forward in, and President Ivany felt that the spirit of what he had heard had been to spend some time on

those things at the core and then let them inform everything else that Acadia did.

There were no further questions.

Motion to adjourn at 5:50 p.m. moved by D. Benoit.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Motion to Approve

PROPOSED MOTION: That the Senate of Acadia University approves the 2015-2020 Strategic Research Plan.

Wordsmithing (subsequent to the November meeting of Senate) Approved by the Senate Research Committee

[An explanatory note from the Chair of the Senate Research Committee]

1. The theme “Community Life and Cultural Diversity” is now proposed as “Community Life, Organizations, and Cultural Diversity”.

Rationale. This allows for a wider inclusion of researchers on campus. This was the rationale when it was first proposed. However, there are two other reasons for making the change. The first is that community organizations are where much of community life plays out, and inserting the word acknowledges that as a focus of research. The second relates to cultural diversity, in that “organizations” names the sites where an important and embedded form of discriminatory action takes place (systemic discrimination). Many who work in cultural diversity on campus are particularly focused on the ways in which minoritized populations are marginalized and disadvantaged. By inserting “organizations” into the theme title we name a structure that infuses both community life and cultural diversity.

2. At the beginning of the theme section on page 4, just above “Community Life, Organizations, and Cultural Diversity,” we have inserted an “overview” paragraph, provided through feedback.

Rationale: We believe it helps to connect what could be seen as four disparity clusters.

3. Wherever we previously used the word “growth,” we were advised that “development” would be more appropriate.

Rationale: The term “growth,” when applied to rural and coastal areas (or any population region), implies improvement narrowly focused on an increase in the quantity of something. Use of the term “development” allows not only for a consideration of quantity but also of quality. Indeed, in some areas, improvement may not come from having more of something, as in for example more retail outlets, but different types of retail outlets that better mine changes in the economy and emerging opportunities.

4. In the action plan, we added a last sentence to the Centre for Rural and Coastal Lifeways Research description. (See page 11).

Rationale: This was suggested by a faculty member as a way of providing more recognition and acknowledgement of the humanities. That seemed reason enough.

5. Minor wording changes/inclusions throughout.

Notice of Motion to accept the small-group discussion process: That, upon Senate voting to support a subsequent motion to suspend the rules (*Roberts Rules*, Art. IV: 22) for the duration of this process, the assembly then follows the group discussion process outlined below, until the conclusion of the small group discussions and their attendant reports:

- The Senate Chair becomes the discussion facilitator, asking Senators to move into their assigned small groups. (The groups have been previously formed by Senator G. Gibson using a stratified random method, and group lists will have been forwarded to Senate members in advance of the meeting). All Senators are supplied with markers and index cards, and each group is assigned to one of three rooms, in order to reduce the clamor of hosting all groups in the Senate chamber.
 - Small group discussion of each question (the questions are repeated below) is limited to 25 minutes. Group members spend the first five minutes individually jotting down on an index card their note-form responses to question 1. The small group discussions ensue for 20 minutes, as group members speak to the points recorded. It will be the responsibility of group members to insure that each member has an opportunity to speak, and that no one member dominates the discussion.
 - The APC member assigned to each group acts as a scribe, responsible for recording key points as they arise in the discussion. The APC member's task is to listen to group members, to take note of key points, and to confirm with group members that these *are* the key points prior to groups reporting back to the assembly.
 - Each group chooses a group member to report key points back to the whole group.
 - After the 25 minute small group discussions conclude, the whole group reassembles in the Senate chamber to hear key points from each group (maximum of 2 minutes per group).
 - These procedures are repeated for question 2.
 - Following the small group processes and reports, if there is time remaining in the meeting, Senate comes out of suspension of the rules, and the Chair allots the remaining meeting time to discussion of the exercise above and the points emanating from it. In any case, time will be allotted in the January Senate meeting for this follow-up discussion.
-

Subsequent use/discussion of the data:

- The key points and index card notes (raw data) will be compiled and distributed to all Senate members, allowing another opportunity for mistakes or misrepresentations of points made to be addressed.
- Because it is difficult for a large body like Senate to undertake data analysis, the raw data will also be forwarded to the APC, this being the sub-committee of Senate whose mandate best aligns with the substance of the questions under discussion. APC members

will be invited to the January meeting of Senate in order for their analysis to be informed by Senate discussion of the matter.

- APC will code the data, identifying emergent themes, and bring their analysis back to Senate at the February meeting, in order for Senators to confirm, reject, amend, etc. the APC's representation of the themes.
- Ultimately, the themes identified become topics which Senate will forward to relevant sub-committees for deliberation/actions to be brought back to Senate.

Discussion Questions:

- 1) What are the preeminent curriculum/academic program principles and priorities you want to see a future Acadia work toward and/or enact?
- 2) Given our current strengths and resources, and given the current university context provincially and federally, how would you imagine operationalizing these principles and priorities? What supports /obstacles might you expect?