



The Chair reported that Senate Executive would be meeting on June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2016 and that agenda items would include the following: approval of Senate meeting dates for 2016-17, introduction for new members of the Executive and the new Senate Chair and the review of the 'big picture' items remaining from this year's Senate agenda and plans for the transition of those items to next year's Senate agenda.

**b) From the President**

President Ivany reported on one item which related to his report to Senate. He stated that at the Federal level the expert panel that would report to Minister Duncan had now been named. D. Naylor was the Chair of the committee and the only Atlantic representative on the committee was M. Crago from Dalhousie University. Their very broad mandate would include an examination of research funding. President Ivany felt there was an opportunity for Acadia to make a submission to the panel about the research funding situation at a high quality small primarily undergraduate university in terms of recent granting council results.

President Ivany had contacted colleagues in the U-4 to encourage them to play a strong advocacy role together and he felt that this would present a powerful message.

**c) From the VP Academic**

R. Perrins had one announcement and reported that the Acadia University had recently signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the Carl von Ossietzky Universität, Oldenburg, in Germany. R. Perrins recognized B. Brackney for his work in facilitating this relationship.

**4) Time Sensitive Items**

**a) Recommendations from the Curriculum Committee for Faculty of Arts Curriculum Changes**

**Motion to approve the recommendations from the Curriculum Committee for Faculty of Arts Curriculum Changes to the Music Therapy program. Moved by J. Hennessy and seconded by C. Rushton.**

**i) Music Therapy**

C. Rushton thanked the Faculty of Arts Curriculum committee and the Senate Curriculum committee for reviewing this proposal for change outside of their normal schedule. She noted that a recent external review of the Music Therapy program had highlighted a number of changes that should be made to the program. The School of Music had moved quickly to make these changes in order to have these in place for the 2016-17 academic cycle.

MOTION APPROVED.

**ii) Minor in Legal Studies**

**Motion to approve the recommendations from the Curriculum Committee for Faculty of Arts Curriculum Changes to the Minor in Legal Studies. Moved by J. Hennessy and seconded by R. Raeside.**

J. Hennessy stated that it had been noticed that the Minor in Legal Studies was in jeopardy because there were insufficient courses being offered to be able to

satisfy the course requirements for the Minor. They consulted with the Coordinator from the Politics Department and it was recommended that a number of summer courses be added to allow students to complete the Minor in Legal Studies. This change was also intended to be in place for September 2016.

A. Quema commented on the importance of minors and she noted that changes were being discussed in the Faculty of Arts in order to refurbish the Arts Core. A. Quema agreed with the idea of revising programming in the Arts but pointed out that in programs such as Women and Gender Studies and in Languages, the minor played an enormous role because it allowed them to attract students to those programs. A. Quema recommended prudence to ensure that certain programs were not undermined. The strength of a program such as WGST did not lie in majors but there were a substantial number of minors. She noted that students were able to discover certain fields of knowledge through the minor.

J. Hennessy agreed and suggested that if this option proposal was successful it would result in a boost for programs such as WGST.

MOTION CARRIED.

5) **Senate Committee Annual Reports**

a) **Curriculum Committee report (*attached*)**

S. Hewitt stated that the two Curriculum committees had now been created and populated which had taken much of the year. The Curriculum committee had continued during the last year with the normal work of that committee, examining curriculum proposals that came forward.

b) **Faculty Development Committee (*attached*)**

L. Price noted that the report was straight forward but that it had been an unusual year with the merging of the Academic Technologies committee and the Faculty Development committee to form the Faculty Support committee.

c) **Academic Program Review Committee (*attached*)**

R. Perrins stated that the Academic Program Review committee had reviewed the Music Therapy program and he noted that the review was still on-going.

d) **Admission and Academic Standing Committee (Policy) (*attached*)**

R. Perrins stated that the Admission and Academic Standing committee did not meet during the last year.

The Chair noted that all annual reports had now been received from Senate sub-committees during the May and June meetings of Senate.

**Motion to receive all annual reports. Moved by B. Brackney and seconded by R. Perrins.**

MOTION APPROVED.

6) **Carried over from Senate Meeting of May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**Motion that the Academic Integrity Committee report back to Senate with recommendations at the September meeting and provide a report on their deliberations during the summer in reviewing the Academic Integrity Assessment Guide**

**Motion that the Academic Integrity Committee report back to Senate with recommendations at the September meeting and provide a report on their deliberations during the summer in reviewing the Academic Integrity Assessment Guide. Moved by A. Kiefe and seconded by D. Holmberg.**

MOTION CARRIED.

The Chair noted that she would inform S. Potter, the Chair of the Academic Integrity committee.

**7) President's Report to Senate (*circulated previously*)**

President Ivany noted that this report would cover a longer time span than was usual and pointed out that it was not possible to consider any one year in isolation. Acadia had worked for years to try to find a sustainable framework that would preserve the essence of the University. President Ivany believed that colleagues had responded well to difficult circumstances. He noted the challenges of taking on too much debt in the past, the changes to the Government funding formula and finally, the sharp drop in enrolment during the 2014-15 year. Acadia was not alone with these challenges and President Ivany still expected that it would take several more years for Acadia to move past these circumstances.

President Ivany stated that the University was in a stronger position in many areas than it had been in 2009. Acadia has led all of Atlantic Canada in enrolment growth over the past seven years and, through the sacrifice of all members of the university community, Acadia was also successful in controlling costs. However, the tension between resource scarcity and our collective desire to maintain quality and the unique Acadia experience was obvious. President Ivany expressed gratitude to faculty and staff for finding creative ways to preserve the 'essence' of Acadia in challenging circumstances. He felt that all high-quality, high-engagement small universities were likely facing a difficult resource-constrained environment for the foreseeable future.

President Ivany felt that the U4 League was critically important. Joint activities between the universities had been excellent but it remained to be seen whether the U4 League could create a Canadian equivalent of the U.S. category of small high quality liberal education universities.

President Ivany stated that the work done by S. Mesheau and others on branding and recruitment was showing signs that Acadia could use the small size as an asset. Acadia continued to grapple with the internal constraints.

President Ivany referred to the Expert Panel that had now been struck. He noted the momentum towards the orthodoxy of the large multiversity becoming more and more embedded as the norm in Canada. Universities that existed far from that mean would not be well served if that orthodoxy became further entrenched.

President Ivany noted that Canada needed to find a way to value the small liberal education institutions. He felt that a category of small institutions needed to be created. On the research side young scholars could find

themselves in the situation that they wanted to come to Acadia but did not feel that they would get funding from the large granting councils. The quality of an institution was rated by its ability to attract and keep quality faculty members. President Ivany expected that the U4 would encourage debate around this issue with the Expert Panel and point out that top undergraduate students often come from small universities where active involvement in research is an institutional priority.

President Ivany felt that the 'Big Picture' discussions in Senate had been valuable during the last year and noted that it was important to be clear about what needed to change and what should stay the same as well as remaining very aware of the external environment. He felt that institutions that were able to cope with changing circumstances would do much better in the future than those that were paralyzed by impending changes to the post-secondary landscape.

G. Gibson noted that the granting councils were answerable to the Treasury Board and wondered whether S. Brison could be invited to events that were offered on campus. This would profile the undergraduate research occurring on campus.

President Ivany agreed and suggested casting a wider net. He felt that the magnitude of the mandate being given to the Expert Panel was quite unprecedented. He encouraged Senators to follow this closely. During his tenure as President of the University of Toronto, D. Naylor was one of the greatest proponents of diversity in the higher education sector.

P. Abela asked about outcome agreements that could be discussed with the Government and referred to Bill 100.

President Ivany responded that the Outcomes Agreement would be the follow on to the Bilateral agreements that have expired. The Government had specified five outcomes that all universities would be asked to report on: finance, efficiency, enrolment, quality programs, and support for student success. Individual institutions that were trying to achieve some objectives that fell outside of these five could propose two or more other outcomes. Acadia had proposed three outcomes to be discussed: brand awareness, support for student success and wellbeing, and support for rural sustainability. He noted that this exercise was not the same as the Outcomes Agreement detailed in Bill 100. That one referred to a situation where a university had got into financial trouble and where the university would then enter into very specific agreements with the Province as to how to get out of trouble.

President Ivany noted that this was a system based exercise and was not currently attached to funding.

A. Quema noted a recent article in the G&M that referred to the Expert Panel and also stated that small universities were protesting against the fact that there was a lack of funding and a lack of recognition. She felt that small universities were up against a huge culture that was present on committees and deeply engrained.

A. Quema cautioned against making too many changes and felt that change should be brought in incrementally and cautiously, often in an experimental way, in order to see whether the change improved things. A. Quema represented that WGST program at Congress and found that there was a lack of coherence across the country. While the Arts Core was being called into question at Acadia, other Universities were introducing Arts Core programs.

President Ivany agreed that there was a need to carefully calibrate the new and innovative while holding firm to elements of the Institution that went to our core values. The desire to do this became obvious when Senate undertook the work on the 'big picture' discussions. He stated that the British North America Act made things challenging for universities because Canadian higher education had become a patchwork quilt of sorts, that resulted in some Provinces going off in one direction while others went in a different direction, instead of creating a coherent policy framework. He stated that institutions needed to look out for themselves and felt that they could not wait around to be rescued, regardless of the Province.

President Ivany noted that Acadia had *de facto* given up some of its autonomy as a result of its financial vulnerability. He was concerned about what would happen in terms of a significant shift in the Granting Councils and research funding in Canada which would now be determined by the Federal government.

J. Stanley reflected on the uniqueness of Acadia noting that all of his family had graduated from Acadia, including his two daughters who both graduated with Honours from Acadia. He noted that they may not have appreciated at the time how special the experience really was. J. Stanley felt that there was a deep pool of Acadia graduates that could be drawn upon to spread the message of who and what Acadia was and what the core of the institution was. He asked whether through the Alumni it would be possible to tap this energy and get the Acadia story told.

President Ivany agreed that there were opportunities to have the story told with a clear focus from Acadia graduates. There was a way for the stories to be told that would highlight the student experiences and attributes in a way that was specific to Acadia.

P. Abela asked whether funding would be fully committed for the renovation of Elliot Hall prior to any work commencing to ensure that Acadia did not go further into debt.

President Ivany confirmed that this was the case.

P. Abela asked for an update on the enrolment situation for 2016-17 and asked whether the University was on track to match the 2014-15 enrolment numbers.

President Ivany confirmed that enrolment numbers were tracking similar to 2014 numbers and that this allowed the University to prove that last year's enrolment drop was in fact an anomaly. This point was an important one in the discussions with the Province because enrolment tended to be a marker of whether a University was being successful in a competitive environment. He

noted that enrolment from Alberta had dropped as a result of the change to the economy in that Province and stated that it was important that Acadia maintain its status as a national university. One of the markers to achieve this was to attract students from all across Canada in addition to attracting a significant international population of students.

President Ivany noted that the 'national university' definition was important because of the view held by some that a truly national university had to meet a certain scale and size criteria. This argument would suggest that within a 25-year period the only remaining national universities would be the larger multiversities. President Ivany stated that Acadia intended to disprove this assumption.

## 8) New Business

### a) **Academic Planning Committee Report: Recommendations to Senate on operationalizing principles and priorities arising from the December 2015 Senate visioning exercise (attached)**

The Chair noted that these recommendations were the result of analysis by the committee of the answers to Question #2 during the 'big picture' exercise. The Chair commented that a number of recommendations for action items were attached to the report from the Academic Planning Committee. Senate was being asked to discuss these recommendations, but not to act on them at this point.

R. Perrins reported that the APC had met on several occasions to work through the data provided by the breakout groups at the December 2015 meeting of Senate. If a theme or similar idea had been raised a number of times the committee had highlighted that fact by providing quotes of actual comments. The APC then attempted to identify which potential Senate sub-committee would work on each issue. R. Perrins noted that existing Senate sub-committees could deal with many of the issues over the course of the next year.

R. Perrins noted that the issues of both diversity and inclusion and community engagement would be better served by the creation of ad-hoc committees.

J. Hennessy referred to V. Archer, an exceptional student who combined Biology and Sociology, who found great difficulty in putting these two degrees together. The difficulties of scheduling required her to be very enterprising. J. Hennessy felt that this was the sort of student that Acadia wanted and that it was important to make scheduling easier for similar students so that they could attend Acadia.

P. Williams asked for the wording "The TIE Committee review current practices of the scheduling of Science laboratories" to be amended to say that "The TIE Committee review current practices of scheduling". He felt that there was a larger problem than just Science Labs.

A. Quema cited an article in the G&M that stated that in some universities groups wanted to see a systematic inclusion of work experience in students' programs. Especially in the Arts there was a desire for several hours a month of work experience. This could be a national undertaking.

The Chair noted that it came from a consortium of university presidents including those from Ryerson and George Brown; institutions that had very extensive Coop arrangements because of the programs that they offered. This was part of a discourse of the universities to provide for work preparation and job readiness.

A. Quema felt that instead of putting pressure on the curriculum there could be an academic analytical preparation within courses which would alleviate the pressure on faculty to deliver a certain kind of curriculum because regardless of what was taught there would be channels whereby replacements would be offered. This would be a more positive way of looking at this.

P. Abela was concerned with the APC response to Group #6 comments and felt that this did not capture the comments adequately. This response from the APC was a far wider frame because although it included faculty it also included all other stakeholders.

Flipping a classroom was discussed and P. Abela asked what this was.

D. Benoit described this as professors preparing material ahead of time on video that the students would watch before coming to class. Students would then be doing the work in class so that there was a lot of dialogue with the professor; the students having received notes and videos previous to the class. He noted that this approach was used in high schools.

J. Banks added that the classroom then became a place where critical thinking took place.

P. Abela liked to think that the students had read their text before coming to class.

A. Quema noted that there was a great deal of dialogue, critical analysis and activity in her classes and that this represented one model of teaching.

The Chair agreed that the same approach took place in Education courses.

G. Gibson mentioned incorporating different pedagogical methods including job training. It was important to look at the purpose of learning rather than the content. More focus on what the students would be needing in their chosen careers versus the content was important. This would be a smart thing for the university to embark upon.

D. Holmberg asked about the process and the next steps, since these were recommendations from the APC.

R. Perrins expected that the process would be similar to that of Question #1 where Senate would provide feedback and ask the APC to come back with a motion.

The Chair explained that unlike the themes emerging from the conversations around Question #1, these were requests for action. Some might be motions for Senate to act in some way, e.g. by creating ad-hoc committees. Senate did



need to endorse these recommendations as part of the key themes that came out of the Senate discussions of Question #2.

The Chair felt that the APC will need to create a plan of action for next year.

D. Holmberg stated that she was comfortable with moving the recommendations out to the sub-committees.

The Chair asked Senators whether they wanted to go through the recommendations and ask the Chair to inform certain Senate sub-committees of topics that they would like them to look at.

D. Holmberg agreed with this approach once Senate had discussed each one.

M. Lukeman agreed and felt this should happen before July when there would be turnover in the committees as he did not want momentum to be lost.

A. Quema agreed but needed the requests to be more specific to the sub-committees. She felt that Senate needed to be more explicit in delegating those tasks to the sub-committees.

D. Holmberg suggested that Senate Executive decide on the specifics and invite Chairs of some of the sub-committee to attend Senate Executive in June or July. Senate Executive could also set up a schedule for the coming year.

The Chair noted that this item was on the Senate Executive agenda.

A. Quema felt that this preparation would be more legitimate if it led to a motion from Senate Executive to Senate in September 2016. This would allow some space and time to be devoted to these issues during Senate meetings but not at the expense of other agenda items.

D. Holmberg pointed out that Senate Executive was not empowered to do anything without Senate approval.

**Motion that Senate Executive be asked to consider recommendations coming from the APC, formulate a plan for moving forward on these recommendations, and bring it to Senate in September. Moved by D. Holmberg and seconded by B. Anderson.**

A. Loder asked about Group #8 and the APC recommendation that the Senate Honours Committee consider strategies to strengthen undergraduate research opportunities and profiles. She pointed out that there was a graduate population on campus and that it was important to showcase both undergraduate and graduate students.

R. Perrins agreed to change the wording to say 'student research'.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Chair asked whether there were any further questions.

D. Benoit pointed out that wording should be changed in Group #2 since the Academic Technologies Committee no longer existed and reporting should come from the Faculty Support Committee. The minutes needed to reflect that this request would go to the Faculty Support Committee.

D. Benoit was concerned that the T.I.E. Committee had just filed a report saying that they had looked at timetabling but felt that they couldn't do anything, so that they needed more direction and could be given a specific request to be considered. An example would be classes on Saturday.

J. Banks agreed and felt that the TIE committee needed empowerment to do something like taking the current schedule and molding it into something new. He felt it would need to be reconstructed completely which would be a major undertaking.

D. Benoit suggested that the TIE committee ought to be given the freedom to propose one or two models that were completely different from what was currently used. If the committee could prove that these models would be better for the students (not necessarily the faculty) and give them more access to classes that were being taught they should be considered.

The Chair stated that Senate Executive would take this under advisement.

b) **Motion from the Awards Committee for changes to consider inclusion of Instructor for Emeriti Status (*attached*)**

**Motion from the Awards Committee to recommend to Senate that Instructors be included in the Emeriti status, and that the *Professores, Librarian and Archivist Emeriti Guidelines* be revised to: *Professores, Librarian, Archivist and Instructor Emeriti*. Moved by P. Williams and seconded by D. Benoit.**

P. Abela was in support of the motion and asked whether Instructors would be asked to meet the same criteria as Professors, Librarians and Archivists.

President Ivany stated that the same criteria would apply and noted that the committee had discussed this at length. Departments making nominations would address the point that the scope would be rather different, since not all Instructors would have a body of work that included national recognition.

MOTION CARRIED.

President Ivany asked whether a second motion was needed to cover the fact that a ten year window would be created to allow departments to reflect backwards. This would be consistent with the approach towards Professor Emeriti several years earlier.

The Chair agreed that a motion would be required.

**Motion to create the same 10-year window on the past that was created for other Emeriti positions in the past. Moved by President Ivany and seconded by P. Williams.**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

- c) **Motion from the By-laws Committee that the Academic Technologies Committee and the Faculty Development Committee be merged to form the Faculty Support Committee (*attached*)**

**Motion from the By-laws Committee that the Academic Technologies Committee and the Faculty Development Committee merge to form the Faculty Support Committee. Moved by J. MacLeod and seconded by D. Benoit.**

D. Holmberg suggested that the three-year terms be staggered initially so that not every faculty member would finish at the same time.

E. Patterson pointed out that the membership of the committee would be nine members, not eight as shown. She also asked that under the “Procedures for Appointment” the selection process for a Librarian should be described to say ‘nominated and elected by Professional Librarians’.

J. MacLeod agreed that this was an omission.

D. Holmberg asked for the exact wording on the Librarians.

Ann Smith explained that the wording should be altered to state: Librarian/Archivist nominated and elected by the Librarians and Archivists in Research Services.

E. Patterson pointed out that many of the Senate sub-committees showed a different wording when it came to the membership of the Librarian.

J. Banks asked whether the By-laws committee could standardize the language in all of the sub-committees.

The Chair agreed that this request could be made.

J. MacLeod asked whether a motion was required.

**Motion that the By-laws committee harmonise the language for appointing Librarians/Archivists to Senate sub-committees. Moved by P. Williams and seconded by R. Perrins.**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

The Chair returned to the original motion.

D. Holmberg asked what amendment was being made to the original motion.

P. Williams stated that the committee membership would go from eight to nine members. Librarian will become Librarian/Archivist. Librarian/Archivist shall be nominated and elected by the Librarians and Archivists in Research Services.

**Amendment to the original motion is that Membership (8) will change to (9). Librarian will change to Librarian/Archivist. Under procedures**

for appointment Librarian/Archivist: nominated and elected by the Librarians and Archivists in Research Services will be added.

Amendment moved by D. Holmberg and seconded by A. Smith.

**AMENDMENT CARRIED.**

**MOTION CARRIED AS AMENDED.**

- d) Motion from the Library Committee that Senate adopt the Open Access Policy (*attached*)

Motion from the Library Committee that Senate adopt the Open Access Policy. Moved by A. Smith and seconded by B. Brackney.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

- e) Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee: Be it moved that the length of term of membership of faculty (including librarian) members on the Senate Library committee be changed from two to three years (*attached*)

Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee: Be it moved that the length of term of membership of faculty (including librarian) members on the Senate Library committee be changed from two to three years.

- f) Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee: Be it so moved that the University Librarian be added to the Senate Executive ex-officio (*attached*)

Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee: Be it so moved that the University Librarian be added to the Senate Executive ex-officio.

The Chair stated that these two motions would be debated at the September meeting of Senate.

This concluded the business of Senate.

**Motion to adjourn by R. Perrins at 3:00 p.m.**

D. MacKinnon expressed thanks to R. Perrins for his service as Acting VP Academic, thanks to P. Williams for his service as Dean of the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science and thanks to A. Vibert for her service as Chair of Senate.

There was warm applause all around.

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

---

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

**Proposed Undergraduate Calendar/Curriculum Changes  
Submitted and Approved by Senate Curriculum Committee**

**FROM THE FACULTY OF ARTS (received at May 10 2016 meeting of FAC)**

**School of Music**

**Course deletions**

**Reason:** The School of Music has moved swiftly to rectify course content and curricular rigour. Deletion of these two courses was necessary, as per the requirements of the recent Music Therapy review.

**MUSI 3583** MUSIC THERAPY SEMINAR 1

**MUSI 4583** MUSIC THERAPY SEMINAR 2

**Course modifications**

**Reason:** The School has acted swiftly and efficiently to respond to the required changes from the most recent Music Therapy review.

**MUSI 1563** MUSIC AND THE MIND – change in calendar description and course title

This course examines how the patterns of music help to make sense of our inner experience. The study includes such topics as the perception of musical processes, the listener and the acoustic environment, musical ability, neurological aspects of perception and performance, musical preference, as well as trans-cultural studies of how music is able to affect people.

**Becomes:**

**MUSI 1563** INTRODUCTION TO MUSIC THERAPY

An introduction to the psychological, neurological, and somatic foundations of music. This course will include current music medicine research, approaches and methods, psychoacoustics, different client populations, and the development of music psychology within the field of music therapy.

**MUSI 2573** A MODERN THERAPY – change in calendar description, course title, and prerequisite

This course presents an overview of the development of Music Therapy as a profession. Current theory, research, and practice will be discussed in light of scientific and trans-cultural development of both musical and medical practice, and how they have come to work together.

**Becomes:**

**MUSI 2573** CLINICAL PRACTICE IN MUSIC THERAPY 1

Assessment and Treatment Process. Includes assessment, ethics, formulation of clinical goals and objectives, and clinical documentation procedures. Students will be introduced to clinical

writing skills and will have an opportunity to shadow/observe an accredited music therapist. B- or better required as prerequisite for consideration for entry to BMT program

*Prerequisite(s) MUSI 1563 with a C- or better*

**MUSI 3563 SKILLS/RESOURCE MUSIC THERAPY** – change in calendar description, course title, and prerequisite

This course introduces students to improvisational and group leading, as well as other interpersonal and clinical skills in music therapy. Issues of assessment, treatment and evaluation are presented. A weekly two-hour practicum accompanies this course. Prereq: Musi 2106 with C- or better

**Becomes:**

**MUSI 3563 SKILLS AND RESOURCES 1**

An examination of skills and resources of music therapy: assessment protocols, structuring and facilitating treatment plans, clinical musicianship, session leading, evaluation and clinical writing, professional issues within a multidisciplinary team, the effective use of self-care, and analysis of current music therapy literature.

*Co-requisite: Music Therapy Practicum 1 (MUSI 3560).*

*Prerequisite(s) MUSI 2573 with a B- or better*

**MUSI 3573 THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS** – change in calendar description, course title, and prerequisite

This course investigates the physical and psychological influences of music. Historical and current theories of music therapy are presented and analyzed. Research methods are studied. A weekly two-hour practicum accompanies this course. Prereq: Musi 2106 with C- or better

**Becomes:**

**MUSI 3573 CLINICAL PRACTICE IN MUSIC THERAPY 2**

Theory, Practice and Research. This course provides the theoretical foundations to examine current music therapy research and approaches, including Analytical Music Therapy, Guided Imagery in Music, Nordoff-Robbins method, Medical Music Therapy, Neurological Music Therapy, Community Music Therapy, and Group Music Therapy.

*Co-requisite: Music Therapy Practicum 2 (MUSI 3570).*

*Prerequisite(s) MUSI 3563 with a B- or better*

**MUSI 4563 CLINICAL PRACTICE** – change in calendar description, course title, and prerequisite

This course reviews music therapy in medicine, and presents effective strategies at working with groups in music. It continues to develop interpersonal and clinical skills for music therapists. A weekly two-hour practicum accompanies this course. Prereq: Musi 2106 with C- or better

**Becomes:**

**MUSI 4563 SKILLS AND RESOURCES 2**

A continuation of music therapy skills and resources: analysis and evaluation, balance between verbal counselling and music, specific client populations, advanced music therapy interventions, and ethical professional boundaries for music therapy. Current music therapy literature and case studies will be utilized.

*Co-requisite: Music Therapy Practicum 3 (MUSI 4560).*

*Prerequisite(s) MUSI 3573 with a B- or better*

**MUSI 4573 PROFESSIONAL ISSUES** – change in calendar description, course title, and prerequisite

This course examines the professional and ethical issues of music therapy in its relationship to individuals, institutions, professional associations, and community. In addition, it continues the study music therapy theory, research, and practice. A weekly two-hour practicum accompanies this course. Prereq: Musi 2106 with C- or better

**Becomes:**

**MUSI 4573 CLINICAL PRACTICE IN MUSIC THERAPY 3**

Case Studies and Professional Issues. In preparation for their internship students will study private practice, regulations and jurisprudence, clinical documentation and case studies, and responsible practice. Students will also learn how to prepare for the MT-BC exams.

*Co-requisite: Music Therapy Practicum 4 (MUSI 4570).*

*Prerequisite(s) MUSI 4563 with a B- or better*

**Program Modification: Bachelor of Music Therapy**

**Reason:** The School of Music recently completed a review of the Music Therapy program. Significant and immediate changes were required. These program changes reflect the new curriculum requirements. The program will be strengthened, the requirements will align with the CAMT (the governing body for Music Therapists) and the curriculum will be more in line with the level of academic rigour found in the rest of the School of Music.

New Program Description:

**Bachelor Music Therapy Requirements (120h)**

1. School of Music Core (33h)
2. MUSI 1666 and MUSI 2666
3. 6h of MUSI 2713
4. 12h from: MUSI 1353, MUSI 1713, MUSI 1733, MUSI 2083 **or** MUSI 2343, MUSI 4663
5. All of the following (18h): MUSI 2573, MUSI 3553, MUSI 3563, MUSI 3573, MUSI 4563 and MUSI 4573
6. 18h PSYC, which must include PSYC 1013, PSYC 1023, PSYC 2113, PSYC 2133, PSYC 2153
7. 12h Music Electives
8. 9h Non-Music Electives
9. First-year music students will take MUSI 1600 and one section of MUSI 2700. Students in each subsequent academic level must successfully complete both terms of MUSI 2700 each year.

**Legal Studies**

Additions to the list of cross-listed courses for the Minor in Legal Studies as follows:

**POLS 3063** Indigenous Law and Governance in Canada



**POLS 4603** First Nations Peoples: Law, Politics and Policy in Canada

**SOCI 2413** First Nations and Aboriginal Peoples of Canada

**SOCI 3143** Social Welfare & Social Policy

**SOCI 3183** Rape & Sexual Assault in Canada

**Reason:** Many of the courses that count towards the multidisciplinary Legal Studies minor are not offered on a regular basis, creating challenges for students to meet the 24h requirement of the Legal Studies minor. These additional courses will strengthen the number of courses that count towards the minor, while still maintaining the focus and integrity of the Legal Studies minor.

*Note:* While these courses will be “new” to the Legal Studies minor, they are being cross-listed from already existing courses.

New Program description:

### **MINOR IN LEGAL STUDIES**

Multidisciplinary Minors offer an alternative to completing the Minor requirements for a degree program in a single discipline. The requirements for a Minor vary by faculty and program(s) of study. BA students are required to complete a minimum of 24h in the Minor program, while BSc students completing a multidisciplinary Minor are required to complete a minimum of 18h in the Minor program. Students pursuing a Minor should consult with their Academic Advisor to ensure that they will meet the requirements for their specific program of study.

A Minor in Legal Studies requires the completion of POLS 1303 and POLS 1403. The balance of the minor is to be chosen from the list courses below. No more than 12h can be in a single discipline. All courses offered towards this minor must be completed with a grade of C- or better.

### **CROSS-LISTED COURSES**

The following courses may be counted towards the Minor in Legal Studies: BUSI 3613, BUSI 3623, BUSI 3643, CLAS 3113, ENVS 3113, HIST 3663, IDST 3103, IDST 3123, PHIL 3203, PHIL 3213, POLS 3063, POLS 3083, POLS 3466, POLS 4403, POLS 4603, SOCI 2413, SOCI 2713, SOCI 2723, SOCI 2753, SOCI 3143, SOCI 3183, SOCI 3703, SOCI 3743, SOCI 4183

## **SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT, 8 JUNE 2016**

### **Membership**

Jeff Banks (Registrar, non-voting), Paul Callaghan (FPS); Glenys Gibson (FPAS) Sonia Hewitt (FA), Chair; Chris Killacky (ADC); Robert Raeside (FPAS), Secretary; Patricia Rigg (FA, July-Dec. 2015), Donna Seamone (FA, Jan.-June 2016) Roxanne Seaman (FPS); Ann Smith (Library); Fallis Thompson (student); Carlie Visser (student)

### **Mandate**

1. To consider recommendations from any Faculty, Department or School for changes in its degree, certificate, or diploma regulations and make recommendations to Senate;
2. To initiate and make recommendations concerning changes in the curriculum; in particular, to make recommendations concerning the requirements for any degree;
3. To consider curriculum changes which may be made necessary by changes in secondary school matriculation standards;
4. To consider submissions from all Departments, Schools, or from any individual, concerning changes in the curriculum;
5. To consider such other matters as Senate may entrust to the Committee.

**Meeting Dates 2015-2016:** October 6 and 27, December 8, 10 and 15, March 3, May 24.

### **The Main Agenda Topics**

#### **1. Division of the Curriculum Committee**

##### **April 13 Senate motion to divide the Curriculum Committee:**

*“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.”*

At the Senate meeting of September 14, the Chair of Senate noted that the process of drafting a motion for the new curriculum committees was an on-going process. Transitional Chair Jeff Banks brought the matter forward to the SCC. The members determined at the October meetings that the current Curriculum Committee would continue as before for the purpose of receiving and examining the curriculum proposals for the 2016-2017 academic calendar. It was recognized that there was an opportunity to review the current mandate of the Curriculum Committee. Members of the SCC also consulted with the APC and By-Laws during this process. Deliberations concluded at the March 3 meeting, and our recommendations for the mandates, membership, and populating of the two committees (SCC Administrative and Policy) were submitted to the By-Laws Committee. The motion of By-Laws Committee concerning these two curriculum committees was approved with amendments at the April 11 meeting of Senate.

#### **2. Examination of curriculum proposals**

The December meetings were devoted to careful review of the 373 pages of curriculum proposals received from the Faculties of Arts, Professional Studies, and Pure and Applied Science. The Chair or designated member of the committee communicated with school directors, departmental chairs, and interdisciplinary program coordinators to resolve various questions or problems that arose during examination of the proposals. These issues were successfully resolved and reported on at the next SCC meeting, or electronically over the December break. The Chair, with the assistance of the Registrar's office, prepared a 50 page summary of the curriculum proposals for Senate. The proposals were approved at the February 22 meeting of Senate. A final meeting of the SCC was convened to review urgent proposals brought forward from the May 10 Faculty of Arts council meeting. These proposals are submitted for approval to the June 15 meeting of Senate.

**Transitional Chairs for 2016/17**

Paul Callaghan, Curriculum Committee, Administrative

Rob Raeside, Curriculum Committee, Policy

Respectfully submitted, Sonia Hewitt, Chair of the Curriculum Committee

## **Report from the Faculty Development Committee (FDC), June 2016**

In September 2015, the Faculty Development Committee agreed on three main goals:

1. to continue to organizing workshops to support teaching excellence at Acadia;
2. to work with the deans to harmonize existing teaching awards in each of the three faculties and further develop criteria and nomination process with the AAAU; and,
3. to work with the Academic Technologies Committee in order to merge the two committees to create the Faculty Support Committee.

This report summarizes our progress toward those three goals.

The FDC held a teaching workshop on October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015. It included a presentation on gender bias in academia from Randy Newman, Psychology, and a presentation on blended learning by Sharon Churchill and Susanne Campbell, Open Acadia. Although the workshop was not as well-attended ( $N \approx 30$ ) as the one held in the previous year, it was well-received. The FDC offered attendees certificates of attendance. The committee decided not to hold a second workshop in February. The main reasons for this were lack of time and resources. That is, two of the four members on the committee (Danny Zacharias, Theology, and Stephen Henderson, Arts-on sabbatical leave Jan. to July, 2016) have not been replaced because the committee is being merged with the Academic Technologies Committee.

Regarding the teaching awards, a member of the FDC (L. Price) will meet with Oonagh Proudfoot (Senior Alumni Officer of the AAAU) and Donnie MacBeath (Awards Chair of the AAAU) to discuss the AAAU teaching award in June. The FDC also recommends that the newly formed Faculty Support Committee work with the deans of the three faculties to harmonize the three teaching awards and promote the awards to increase the number of nominations.

Finally, over the academic year, L. Price has had a number of meetings with Jim MacLeod and Herb Wyile (By-Laws Committee), and Jeff Banks (Chair, Academic Technologies Committee) to review drafts of the proposed mission statement, duties and membership of the Faculty Support Committee. A final draft has been submitted for review by Senate at the June, 2016 meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Price, Chair  
Faculty Development Committee

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Annual Report to Senate for 2015-2016**

June 14, 2016

**Committee Members 2015-2016**

Bob Perrins, Vice-President Academic (Acting) (Chair)  
 Jeff Banks, Acting Registrar (Secretary)  
 Christianne Rushton  
 Ann Dodge  
 Sonya Major  
 Jim Stanley  
 Deans of academic unit under review

**Purpose of Committee:**

- (1) To determine policy and procedures for conducting program reviews;
- (2) To determine annually which academic units are to be reviewed;
- (3) To select the members of each unit review committee;
- (4) To oversee the process of review in each case;
- (5) To make recommendations to Senate on the basis of the findings of each unit review committee
- (6) To deal with such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

**Meeting Dates:**

October 7, October 14, 2015 and May 11, 2016

Department	Status	Report to Senate
Biology	Site Visit October 23 and 24, 2013; review panel report rec'd; department response pending; APRC interview with Biology Head pending	
E&ES (Geology)	Site Visit and review conducted, September 22 & 23, 2014; Departmental Response received; APRC interview with Geology pending	
Math & Stats	APRC Interview with department pending	
Music	Music Therapy Site Visit March 13-15, 2016; review panel report rec'd, school's response received, APRC interview with Director completed; APRC Recommendations to Senate are pending	
General BA/B.Sc	Preliminary discussions on review of the degree and degree requirements; external review to be scheduled in the fall of 2016	

Respectfully submitted,



Bob Perrins, Vice-President Academic (Acting)  
 Chair, Academic Program Review Committee

**ADMISSION & ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEE (Policy)**

**Annual Report to Senate for 2015-2016**

June 14, 2016

**Committee Members 2015-2016**

Bob Perrins (Chair)  
Jeff Banks, Registrar (Acting) (Secretary)  
Peter Williams (Dean, Pure & Applied Science)  
Jeff Hennessy (Dean, Arts (Acting))  
Heather Hemming (Dean, Professional Studies)  
Jeff Banks (Director)  
Brian Van Blarcom (Arts Head)  
Christian Thomas (Arts)  
Ian Hutchinson (Prof. Studies Director)  
David Piper (Prof. Studies)  
Sonya Major (Science Head)  
Rob Raeside (Science)  
Anna Robbins (Theology)  
Fallis Thompson (ASU VPA)

**Purpose of Committee:**

To interpret and to apply the conditions of admissions and academic standing as outlined in the University Calendar and to make recommendations to Senate with respect to its policy as it relates to admissions, failures, and academic regulations.

This committee did not meet during the 2015-16 academic year.

Respectfully submitted by the Chair,



Bob Perrins  
Vice-President Academic (Acting)  
Chair, Admission and Academic Standing Committee (Policy)

**President Ivany's Report to Senate (*circulated separately*)**

### **Recommendations to Senate from the Academic Planning Committee Concerning Operationalizing Principles and Priorities Arising from the December 2015 Senate Visioning Exercise**

On the basis of the opinions generated by the December 2015 Senate visioning exercise (see Senate Agenda of 14 March 2016 for a copy of the group contributions to that exercise), the APC offers the following recommendations for the priorities, goals, and tasks of Senate Committees. The order does not imply any ranking on the part of the APC, and is based on Question #2 posed during the December 2015 visioning exercise (“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?”):

Group 5: “Opportunities afforded by the U4 model need to be explored/actioned as appropriate.” The APC recommends *that Senate as a body explore connections / relationships with other institutions.*

Group 1: “Operationalizing what we mean by a liberal education – should there [be] central courses that all students take – [a] common core.” The APC recommends *that the newly-established Curriculum Policy Committee review and operationalize the concept and practice of a Liberal Education.*

Group 2: “Timetabling needs to be re-thought (e.g. science students need labs but that means they can’t take a lot of Arts courses due to scheduling).” The APC recommends *that the TIE Committee review current practices of the scheduling.*

Group 5: “Timetabling – needs to be examined to create greater flexibility for students. This can be within the existing two-semester framework, or we can also look at spring/summer expansions for students to complete their studies in 3 years, for example. (Fee structures, etc., could be looked at).” The APC recommends *that the TIE Committee determine the feasibility of broader offerings in spring/summer sessions, and that the Registrar review current fee structures with the intention of facilitating flexibility for students.*

Group 2: “Role of Technology in learning” / Possibilities of alternatives (“Hybrid course offerings – off/online”) – The APC recommends *that the Faculty Support Committee should consider these issues.*

Group 6: “Talk of pedagogy needs to happen outside of the bargaining table (for example, class sizes, teaching hours, etc.) / Who is to initiate this? How do we ensure that these provide a safe and trusting environment? / A bottom up idea could be an option, let the ideas come from the departments and the faculties / The Board [of Governors] needs to understand what the issues are and be open to hear from faculty.” The APC recommends *that the Teaching Resource Committee (Joint Board of Governors / Senate) develop a strategy to determine from all stakeholders what resources are needed to be effective teachers.*



Group 8: “[Explore] ways of fostering innovative curricular programming options... e.g. a course is 3h per week: can we use those 3h in more innovative ways, like flipping a classroom?” The APC recommends *that the newly-established Curriculum Policy Committee consider options for class delivery options extending beyond the 3h / 6h option, considering the models for alternative delivery formats already in place in some programs.*

Group 8: Enhancing Research Opportunities – “improve showcasing of student research (esp. in Arts)”; “research funding challenges - engage donors, etc. to fund student research”. The APC recommends *that the Senate Honours Committee consider strategies to strengthen student research opportunities and profiles.*

Finally, the APC recommends the *Creation of Ad-Hoc Committees by Senate to consider the academic dimensions of Diversity and Inclusion and of Community Engagement.*



**OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT**

---

**TO:** MEMBERS OF SENATE, ACADIA UNIVERSITY  
**FROM:** RAYMOND E. IVANY, PRESIDENT AND VICE-CHANCELLOR  
**SUBJECT:** INSTRUCTOR EMERITI  
**DATE:** JUNE 6, 2016

---

The Awards Committee for Honorary Degrees and Emeriti Distinction (Awards Committee) received a request from Dr. Peter Williams asking that the committee consider the inclusion of the category of Instructor for the status of Emeriti.

The committee met to discuss the request in October 2015 and February 2016, and after thorough review, recommend to Senate that Instructors be included in the Emeriti status, and that the *Professores, Librarian and Archivist Emeriti Guidelines* be revised to: *Professores, Librarian, Archivist and Instructor Emeriti*.

The current document with the proposed draft revisions is included.

June 6, 2016

---

Raymond E. Ivany

---

Date

President and Vice-Chancellor

## **Awards Committee for Honorary Degrees and Emeriti Distinction (Awards Committee)**

### **Professores, Librarian, Archivist and Instructor Emeriti Guidelines**

The title of Emeritus is an honour to be conferred upon a retiring or recently retired Professor, Librarian, Archivist or Instructor who is being recognized for a distinguished academic career and exemplary service to Acadia University.

#### ***Criteria***

The Emeritus title:

- Is an honour that recognizes scholarly and professional excellence as well as meritorious service to Acadia University over an extended period of time.
- Reflects a standard of excellence that normally includes national and/or international recognition.
- Is conferred upon a retiring or recently retired (within 5 years of retirement) Professor/Librarian/Archivist/Instructor.
- Is normally reserved for those individuals who have at least 10 years of full-time service at Acadia University.

#### ***Nominating Procedures***

1. A call for nominations to the University Community, Vice-President Academic, University Librarian, Deans, Directors and Department Heads for the Emeriti Distinction will occur by October 1<sup>st</sup> of each year.
2. Nominations may be submitted by a Department, Unit, School, Programme, Dean, VP Academic, University Librarian or by the nominee him/herself and, in all cases, must have supporting documentation attesting to their worthiness of this distinction. In the case of self-nominations, the nominee's Department (and/or Interdisciplinary Program) and Dean(s) will be asked to provide a letter of support.
3. Where a Department/Unit/School/Programme, a Dean, VP Academic or University Librarian decides to nominate a retiring or recently retired Professor/Librarian/Archivist/Instructor, the Head/Director/Coordinator is to inquire of the individual whether s/he wishes to be so considered for this distinction.

4. Where a Professor/Librarian/Archivist/Instructor agrees to let her or his name stand, s/he is to provide a dossier, including a curriculum vitae and other supporting documentation for consideration by the Committee. This dossier is to be forwarded to the President's Office normally no later than January 31<sup>st</sup>.

### ***Selection Process***

1. All nominations will be reviewed by the Awards Committee.
2. The Committee may decide to:
  - a. Recommend the nomination to Senate
  - b. Seek additional information from the nominator in which case the nomination may be held over for further consideration
  - c. Not recommend the nomination .
3. The Committee's report to Senate shall include a list of all candidates in categories 2(a) and 2(c); the Committee's recommendation regarding each candidate (i.e., recommend / not recommend the candidate); and a brief explanation of the grounds for their recommendation in each case.
4. Voting at Senate shall be through a secret ballot indicating support / lack of support for each candidate. A two-thirds majority vote in either direction shall be binding. Candidates that do not receive a two-thirds majority vote in either direction may, if the candidate and nominator(s) so desire, be resubmitted for reconsideration by the Committee in the following year.
5. Professors/Librarians/Archivists/Instructors upon whom Senate confers the Emeritus distinction will have their names listed in the record of Convocation.

### ***Privileges of Emeritus Title***

- To be able to serve on undergraduate and graduate theses committees.
- To have their names listed in the Acadia University calendar.
- To be invited to Convocation and the academic procession.
- To have access to full faculty library privileges.
- To be provided with Datatel access by special request (e.g. holders of research grants).
- To be entitled to bear the title "Professor/Librarian/Archivist/Instructor Emeritus".
- To have access to shared office/lab space should space be available, subject to annual review (key access to this space to be obtained by special request).





	Period
1 VPA (or designate)	ex-officio
1 Association of Atlantic Universities FDC rep	ex-officio
1 Coordinator of Academic Technologies	ex-officio
1 Arts	3 yrs.
1 Prof. St.	3 yrs.
1 P & A Sc.	3 yrs.
1 Theology	3 yrs.
1 Librarian/Archivist	3 yrs
1 Student	1 yr.

Procedures for Appointment

Chair: Elected by the committee members.

Faculty: Nominated and elected within each Faculty.

Librarian/Archivist: Nominated and elected by the Librarians and Archivists in Research Services

Student: Appointed by the ASU VP Academic

## **Motion that Senate adopt the Acadia University Open Access Policy**

### **Introduction**

Acadia University is committed to disseminating research and scholarship as widely as possible. Open-access literature is digital and freely accessible at the point of use for the reader. It normally contains less copyright or licensing restrictions so researchers and the wider community can rapidly share and benefit from the results of the research.

This policy encourages all members of the research community at Acadia University to recognize and participate in open access principles and practices. It is a reminder to Acadia's research community of the Tri-Agency Open Access Policy on Publications (February 27, 2015) and is designed to increase awareness of its directives. It is intended to facilitate long-term preservation and access to Acadia's intellectual output. The policy applies to all the members of the research community at Acadia University including but not limited to faculty, students, and staff.

### **Policy**

Without contravening any collective agreements in place at the University:

1. Acadia scholars are encouraged routinely to provide a copy of their article published in a journal or conference proceeding to place in the non-commercial open access institutional repository *Acadia Scholar*, and to deposit in other open access repositories where such deposit is required by a funding agency, or desired by the author.
2. The scholarly work would be deposited, as the author's final post-peer review manuscript or (where permitted by the publisher) the publisher's PDF, immediately on acceptance for publication.
3. Wherever possible, open access would be provided immediately upon acceptance for publication.
4. The Vaughan Memorial Library shall maintain an institutional repository (e.g., *Acadia Scholar*).
5. The Vaughan Memorial Library shall manage an institutional repository according to international standards for institutional repositories.
6. The Vaughan Memorial Library will support researchers in adhering to this policy.
7. In the event that a faculty member is requested to assign all or a part of his or her copyright in such scholarly works as part of a publication agreement, the faculty member is encouraged to request in the publication agreement the right, at a minimum, to deposit in the institutional repository *Acadia Scholar*. The *Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) Canadian Author's Addendum to Publication Agreement* may be used for this purpose.
8. Researchers in receipt of Tri-Agency funding must comply with the [Tri-Agency Open Access Policy on Publications](#), by
  - a. depositing their final, peer-reviewed publications in an institutional repository within 12 months of publication, or by
  - b. publishing their peer-reviewed articles in a journal which offers immediate or eventual open access within 12 months



9. Scholars are encouraged to consider open access and affordable/sustainable scholarly communication venues in deciding on where to publish scholarly work.
10. Scholars are encouraged to deposit other types of full-text works in Acadia Scholar such as conference publications, monographs, and posters, and any other material deemed appropriate as representative of the individual's scholarly or creative output.

**Procedures:**

1. Researchers will contact the Vaughan Memorial Library or the Division of Research and Graduate Studies for further information regarding open access and compliance with Tri-Agency requirements
2. The Vaughan Memorial Library will assist the research community with the deposit and posting of scholarly material into the institutional repository i.e, *Acadia Scholar*
3. Students with a thesis requirement will continue to follow Acadia's [Electronic Thesis Deposit Procedures](#). Senate passed the electronic theses mandate for graduate and undergraduate students on the 14 October, 2008.

**Guidelines:**

1. All members of the Acadia research community are strongly encouraged to deposit their scholarly works, into the institutional repository *Acadia Scholar*.
2. In most cases, the publisher determines the form in which an article may be made accessible in the institutional repository (e.g. pre-print, post-print, or published version.) Tri-agency grant recipients are responsible for determining which publishers allow for the retention of copyright or what permissions are included in their publishing agreement(s). All researchers are encouraged to determine their author rights before selecting a publisher.

**Reporting and Review**

The University Librarian will submit an annual report to the Chair, Senate Library Committee on Open Access participation through Acadia's institutional repository, *Acadia Scholar*.

**Credits**

This policy is adapted (with permission) from the Senate Library Committee, Mount Saint Vincent University. (2016). *Open Access Policy* (SLC-2016-01). Retrieved from the Mount Saint Vincent Senate Website:

<http://www.msvu.ca/en/home/aboutus/universityprofile/senate/policies/default.aspx>

and adapted (with permission) from the Research Advisory Committee, University of Prince Edward Island. (2012) *Open Access & Dissemination of Research Output*. Retrieved from the UPEI Website: <http://www.upei.ca/research/policies>

**Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee**

**Be it moved that the length of term of membership of faculty (including librarian) members on the Senate Library Committee be changed from two to three years**

**Rationale:**

Over the past year the Senate Library Committee has reviewed its mandate and the structure and length of term of its membership. The Senate Library Committee recommends that the length of membership for the Faculty (including librarian) committee members be extended to three years (from two) with the terms for the students remaining the same: i.e., one year. This would allow some continuity on the committee and create the opportunity to discuss and move on some larger issues with representatives on the committee having more familiarity with pertinent details. The change would also make the terms of service similar to the term lengths of other Senate committees. It is still important that the committee receives input across a number of disciplines and faculties, and therefore the number of members on the committee should remain the same. The mandate was reviewed and reaffirmed by the Senate Library Committee.

**As a point of reference:**

**Current Membership & Terms of Reference of the Senate Library Committee**

Duties:

The University Librarian, liaison Librarian, students, and faculty members work collaboratively:

- 1) To consult actively with their constituents, to offer another conduit through which constituents convey their academic concerns regarding the library and to address these concerns by various means, including the formulation of policies;
- 2) To advocate for necessary and appropriate resources for the academic functions of the library;
- 3) To develop policy recommendations with regard to the library’s collection development;
- 4) To develop policy recommendations with regard to the library’s support of research
- 5) To make an annual report

**Current Membership & Terms**

1 University Librarian	ex-officio
1 Chair (Senator)	3 year
1 Professional Librarian	1 year
1 Arts	2 year
1 Arts	2 year
1 Prof. Studies	2 year
1 Prof. Studies	2 year
1 P&A	2 year
1 P&A	2 year

1 Theology	1 year
1 Student (VP Academic)	1 year
1 Student	1 year
1 Graduate Student	1 year

Procedures for Appointment of Faculty: Nominated and elected within each Faculty two members with each appointed for either a one year or two year term on a rotational basis throughout all academic units, with no one unit sitting twice before other units have served one term.

Procedures for Appointment of Chair: Committee Chair is nominated by the Nominating Committee from the membership of Senate, with further nomination from the Senate, and elected by Senate.

Procedures for Appointment of Librarian: Nominated and elected within the Professional Librarian Group

**Process for change:**

If this motion is passed, the present Senate Library Committee members will set up an internal and initial process so that the length of the present terms (two years) be staggered to avoid a complete overhaul of committee members at one time.

## **Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee**

Be it so moved that the University Librarian be added to the Senate Executive *ex officio*

### **Rationale:**

Over the past year the Senate Library Committee has been reviewing its mandate and as part of this review were surprised to discover that the University Librarian was not part of the Senate Executive. As a consequence of this discovery, and since the other deans and the Registrar do sit on the Executive, the Senate Library Committee recommended that the University Librarian be added to the Senate Executive *ex officio*. The Librarians and Archivists were actively consulted as part of this process and were unanimous in their support of the position of University Librarian being added to the Senate Executive.

The importance of the Vaughan Memorial Library at the centre of the teaching, research, and learning process is well understood at Acadia. Librarians and Archivists sit on Senate and numerous Senate sub-committees. The University Librarian sits on both Curriculum Committees (Administrative) and Curriculum Committee (Policy) in an *ex-officio* role. Like the Deans, the University Librarian sits on Senate sub-committees such as the Academic Planning Committee (*ex officio*). Senate is the most representative body on campus. The Senate Library Committee would like to add the role of University Librarian to Senate Executive.

### **As a point of reference:**

### **Current Membership & Terms of Reference of the Senate Executive Committee**

#### Duties:

- (1) between meetings of Senate, to consider matters that in its judgement call for senatorial action or that by statute law may require senatorial action;
- (2) to consider matters referred to it by Senate
- (3) in extraordinary circumstances dictated by time constraints, and from submissions of the Nominating Committee, appoint a Senator(s) to specific Senate and/or other University Committees. The Senator(s) so appointed may serve on the specific committee prior to the upcoming meeting of Senate where the appointment will be confirmed or modified.

Membership (12)	Term
1 Chair of Senate	ex-officio
1 Deputy Chair of Senate	ex-officio
1 President	ex-officio
1 Vice-President (Academic)	ex-officio
1 Dean of Arts	ex-officio
1 Dean of P&A Sc.	ex-officio
1 Dean of Prof. St.	ex-officio

1 Dean of R & G Studies	ex-officio
1 Registrar (Secretary) (Non-voting)	ex-officio
1 Dean of Theology (Theology Only)	ex-officio
1 Student Vice-President Academic	ex-officio
1 Senate Representative	1 year
1 Senate Representative	1 year
1 Senate representative	1 year

Chair: Chair of Senate (Ann Vibert currently)

Procedures for Appointment: Senate representatives are nominated by the Nominating Committee, with further nominations from Senate, and elected by Senate.