



Minutes of the Senate meeting of Tuesday 13th October, 2015

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Tuesday 13th October, 2015 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair A. Vibert presiding and 42 present and 6 guests.

- 1) Approval of Agenda **Motion to approve the agenda, moved by D. MacKinnon, seconded by R. Perrins.**

MOTION CARRIED.

- 2) Minutes of the Meeting of 14th September, 2015 **Motion to approve the Minutes of Monday 14th September, 2015 as distributed. Moved by B. Anderson, seconded by C. Rushton.**

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

E. Patterson requested that in the final paragraph on Page 10, *Q. Phillips* be changed to read *G. Phillips*.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS REVISED CARRIED.

3) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

Regrets were received from President Ivany, L. Aylward, G. Poulter, D. Benoit, P. Rockwell, D. Holmberg and R. Densmore. G. Phillips would be arriving late.

A welcome was extended to J. Stanley (Board of Governors) for a second term, J. Colton who would be replacing G. Bissix until the end of the fall term and J. Graham (student Senator for Professional Studies). S. Grey was replacing L. Murphy as the interim ASU President for the immediate future.

The Chair also welcomed six guests attending from two Senate sub-committees. Members of the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee were S. Landry, J. Noel Walsh and P. d'Entremont. Members of the Academic Integrity committee were S. Potter, S. Ahern and J. Holt.

There were no objections to the guests attending Senate.

The Chair reported that Senate Executive had met on September 28th, 2015 and that the committee had followed up on a request from Senate to decide the timelines for Senate to discuss priority items during 2015-2016.

The Chair stated that items would be discussed in the following order:

- Academic Integrity issues

- Equitable distribution of Tier 1 Scholarships
- Where does Acadia see itself in 10 years
- Mandate of the new Curriculum committee (Policy) and under that mandate a number of items including i) consideration of the consistency of minors and majors, ii) consideration of a common requirement of 6hr credit hours of English or an equivalent writing intensive course as approved by Senate, and iii) a review of the level of 1st, 2nd and 3rd year courses and whether there were differences among them.
- Continued work on changes to the slot system including differential credit hours. This would be articulated to the T.I.E. committee and the Curriculum committee.
- Consideration of mechanisms and processes for large scale degree and changes. This would fall under the purview of both the Academic Planning committee and the Curriculum committee.

The Chair pointed out that some of these items could be discussed at the same time by different committees.

The Chair stated that the second item discussed by the Senate Executive related to item # 3 '*Where did Acadia see itself in 10 years*'. An Ad hoc committee had been struck, comprising of the Chair of Senate Executive, the Dean of Pure and Applied Science, the Dean of Arts and the ASU VP Academic. The Ad-hoc committee would be meeting on Wednesday with G. Gibson who had originally suggested this priority item and who also had ideas on how to organise the discussion at Senate.

Finally the Chair reported that Senate Executive had also identified its priorities for 2015-16, but that she would speak to these under the Senate Executive report later in the agenda.

b) From the VP Academic

R. Perrins updated Senate on events that had occurred in the three Faculties.

In the Faculty of Arts Acadia University hosted the U4 Workshop "Community Engagement at the U4 University," this past weekend. It was a very successful event, with participation from all four institutions. There were very strong contingents from Mount Allison and Bishop's universities and, although their student group had to withdraw at short notice, the presentation and involvement by the Director of Saint Francis Xavier's Service Learning office was both engaging and valuable. A total of 29 students, staff, and faculty participated directly in making presentations; of this total Acadia was very well represented with 16 presenters on five different topics. A particular highlight of the presentations was that delivered by Acadia's kNOWMORE group from the Dept. of Sociology.

The formal workshop was very well attended – despite people's schedules a total of 25 participants worked to develop a working document that will evolve into a Foundations Document that will inform community engagement activities at all four U4 institutions.

In the Faculty of Professional Studies M. Rogers, new faculty member in the School of Education, has just produced for screening his first short film. The film, entitled "a list," stems from M. Rogers' research with Maritime young people and was funded by a grant through the Short Film Venture Program of

the New Brunswick Government and by the NB filmmakers' cooperative. The first screening of "a list" will take place at the Silver Wave film festival on November 7th, and the film will be on the festival circuit for a year after that, making its way to the Atlantic Film Festival and the Toronto International Film Festival in 2016. Dr. Rogers plans to develop teaching materials around this and other Atlantic Canadian films to be used in public schools in Social Studies, Sociology, and English Language Arts contexts.

In mid-September J. Colton, Department of Community Development and the Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program presented a draft of "The Exploring Social Acceptance Issues For Energy Development" sponsored by the Institute of Public Policy centered at the University of Calgary. The Institute presented eight recommendations to guide future energy development in Canada focusing on a more robust regulatory process that is more inclusive of stakeholder concerns.

Now up and running are two community engagement and environmental education programs directed by A. Warner and led by Acadia students from the Department of Community Development and the Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program. Mysterious Encounters with Grade 5 classes happens on Acadia's Woodland Trails and the Planet Protectors with Grade 3s takes place at Valley Waste. There will be 10 classes and about 225 children running through day long outdoor environmental education programs which provides meaningful leadership experiences for our students and a great learning opportunity for elementary students drawn from throughout Kings County.

In the area of cross faculty collaboration the Women and Gender Studies Program and the Department of Community Development co-sponsored a presentation at the beginning of October by Malika Viridi, a visitor to Acadia from the Himalaya of Northern India. Malika spoke to an enthusiastic full house in the K. C. Irving Auditorium about her work organizing rural farm women in Northern India.

4) Time Sensitive items

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a) Approval of Graduates | Motion to approve the list of Graduates for the fall, moved by R. Perrins, seconded by J. Banks. |
| i) Motion to approve the list of Graduates for the fall (<i>circulated</i>) | MOTION APPROVED. |
| ii) Enabling Motion | Enabling Motion, moved by R. Perrins, seconded by J. Banks. |

R. Perrins read the Enabling Motion:

Any candidate for an Acadia degree, diploma or certificate who should receive a grade or otherwise qualify or be disqualified between this Senate meeting and the Senate meeting in April, may, if circumstances require, be considered by the Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee, the appropriate Dean, the appropriate Head/Director, and the Registrar, acting as an ad hoc committee of Senate, they having the power to make consequential amendments to the graduation list. Any such amendments to the list shall be reported to Senate at the next Senate meeting.

MOTION APPROVED.

5) New Business

a) 2015-2016 Enrolment Report (*attached*)

S. Mesheau presented the enrolment report and demonstrated enrolment growth that had occurred since 2008. S. Mesheau pointed out comparisons with other Maritime universities, noting that during these years Acadia had managed to grow its enrolment at a time when others were seeing their enrolment numbers drop. She noted however that this year 12 universities showed a drop in enrolment, three were flat and one showed an increase.

Enrolment had dropped for Acadia this year and S. Mesheau stressed the need to get enrolment numbers back to those of 2014-2015. The large drop in students from Nova Scotia was of concern because demographics clearly indicated that those numbers will continue to drop in future years. There had also been a drop in students from western Canada and from Ontario.

S. Mesheau noted that across Canada there was over capacity in universities and that there was increased competition as a result of Ontario universities recruiting in Atlantic Canada. In Ontario, a tuition rebate program had been initiated in Ontario which offered a rebate of 30% of university fees to students if they remained in the Province.

S. Mesheau pointed out that Acadia had received negative publicity on a number of issues during the peak recruitment period: the meningitis outbreak, CBC's study of sexual assault reports from various universities, and a report from a student who suggested that they had been removed from residence because of voicing self-harm thoughts.

S. Mesheau explained that the Recruitment operation had received an in depth study to determine whether they were competitive and to decide what needed to be done to remain competitive. As a result, some changes have been made. The recruitment team has been reorganised to give the maximum number of recruiters on the road. One new position had been added, that of Recruitment Director for Canada, which was held by A. Batra. He was spending time on the road but also acting as a resource to the other recruiters. Business processes were studied to determine better ways to track applications and increase the yield through to registration.

S. Mesheau stated that the entrance scholarship program was under review to ensure that competitive scholarships were being offered. Admission requirements were also being reviewed.

Two new branding initiatives were in place. The first indicated how Acadia was different from other institutions and the new Viewbook told the Acadia story well. The second initiative was a result of working with the U4 institutions to demonstrate the style of Acadia across Canada.

The new recruitment strategy included generating awareness of Acadia from September to December and starting to engage students and parents. Relationships continued to be built with Guidance Counsellors and students were being admitted very quickly. This continues from January to April but there is also a need to increase the engagement of prospective students and then start to transition them into registration. From May to August recruiting continues and the office focusses on transitioning students into Acadia.

S. Mesheau stated that Acadia was seeing an increase in the number of

applications this year.

On the domestic front the Recruiters were targeting their efforts to ensure the biggest return and were therefore focussing on Halifax, Ottawa, Toronto, Calgary and Vancouver as well as going after certain type of schools. S. Mesheau noted that one position in the Recruitment office was an on-line position, which would give a larger presence on social media. Campus tours were being improved and it was recognised that getting students and parents on campus had a big influence on whether they applied to Acadia.

S. Mesheau noted the need to continue to engage the faculty and alumni in recruiting efforts.

On the international front the focus was again on high return markets. Two feeder systems were used successfully by other institutions and so Acadia would now be adopting this approach in the future. One was to focus on agreements with other international schools to build a good feeder system, and the second was to build a good agent network.

S. Mesheau thanked the Senators for their support of the recruiting effort.

H. Kapoor asked where the high return markets were for Acadia.

S. Mesheau stated that presently China, the Caribbean and the USA were the high return markets.

H. Kapoor asked about India and S. Mesheau agreed that India, Japan and the UK would represent secondary markets.

P. Abela thanked S. Mesheau for the presentation but expressed concern about the drop in numbers. He acknowledged the analysis that had been carried out and pointed out that recruitment appeared to have dropped off during the first year that S. Mesheau had gone through a full recruitment cycle. P. Abela asked whether there had been structural changes that had been made and had not worked. P. Abela asked whether strategies that were previously in place would now be re-initiated, or was the Recruitment office initiating new strategies for the coming year.

S. Mesheau responded that careful analysis had been carried out and that decisions were not unilateral. She noted that last year the University changed to later registration for first year students. This put Acadia in line with other institutions but meant that the Recruitment office could not see that there were problems so quickly. S. Mesheau felt that the increase in the level of competition and the demographic decline combined last year to produce the drop in numbers.

P. Abela asked about the lock in process of moving applications to registrations and whether Acadia was similar to other institutions. He discussed the \$45 application fee and asked whether this gave the Recruitment office a sense of how things were going.

S. Mesheau responded that this approach had been successful in the past and would continue. She noted that the amount required for the residence deposit had been increased to be more in line with other institutions.

A. Quema thanked S. Mesheau for the analysis and asked about the point at

which academic advising could take place for new students. A. Quema felt that academic advising would show students how Acadia differs from other universities. She asked when and in what way academic advising could occur.

S. Mesheau stated that the two Open House events would be the start of academic advising, followed by the calling campaigns. S. Mesheau commented that the recruiters would offer advice on admission requirements, but not on academic advising.

J. Banks stated that the Admissions office would be in contact with Department Heads and Directors when a student had questions during the admission process.

A. Quema was concerned that recruiters were carrying out academic advising with new students. She had asked first year students about this and received feedback from them. A. Quema did not feel that recruiters should be engaging in academic advising.

S. Mesheau agreed.

J. Stanley thanked S. Mesheau for the presentation and commented that he was concerned at the disproportionate sized impact that any 'bad news' piece could have on enrolment decisions by students and their parents.

S. Mesheau agreed that bad news was an important factor in the enrolment process and cited problems experienced this year by another institution as a result of bad press last year.

G. Gibson asked about the Ontario aggressive approach to enrolment in Nova Scotia.

S. Mesheau responded that their recruiters would go into the Nova Scotia schools, offer presentations, meet with students and their parents; and that they had done this twice during the last year. Ontario universities were also suggesting that they could provide a small university experience, or personalized attention, in a large university.

P. Williams pointed out that schools and departments do provide the recruiting staff with a 'Guide to Choosing First Year Courses' and that they should ensure that the information is accurate.

R. Worvill asked whether any recruiters were working with schools in much smaller communities, in addition to the large cities across Canada.

S. Mesheau agreed that this was being pursued. Students needing to travel for university often did not want to go to a big city.

E. Patterson asked whether an external consultant was hired to assist with the re-branding exercise.

S. Mesheau confirmed that an external consultant had been hired and that work was also carried out in-house.

E. Patterson asked what S. Mesheau had meant when she referred to admission blockages.

S. Mesheau cited an example from UNB when the university was requiring high school courses for a program that would not have been required by other universities. When the recruiters built relationships with the Guidance Counsellors they would check to see that the requirements were not causing problems for the high school graduates.

P. Abela asked whether the 1100 new student number was achievable.

S. Mesheau confirmed that 1100 students was their objective for 2015-2016.

H. Kapoor suggested that there could be large market in India for undergraduate degrees.

S. Mesheau offered to provide more information but stated that agents were working on behalf of Acadia in India. It would unfortunately require a lot of money for Acadia to become well known in India.

J. Hennessy commented that because several Acadia Alumni were employed as recruiters it was quite likely that some informal course advising was taking place.

S. Mesheau stated that during the month of August a very rigorous training was carried out for recruiters, some of which was provided by faculty members. Recruiters were trained to listen but obviously also had conversations with students.

A. Kiefte mentioned Memorandum of Agreements that Acadia had with colleges such as NSCC, and asked whether Acadia was focussing on post-secondary transfers.

S. Mesheau agreed that post-secondary transfers made up a fairly large percentage of the incoming student body, both nationally and internationally. The Registrar's office had a list of these institutions.

The Chair asked whether anyone had not yet had an opportunity to ask a question.

A. Quema pointed out that new students were fairly shy and were hesitant to ask questions. She asked how the recruiters encourage students to not wait until the Open House, but to go ahead and feel free to contact individual faculty members.

S. Mesheau agreed that this was important but that they attempted first to get the students to come on campus and then get talking to the academic faculty.

The Chair thanked S. Mesheau and the Registrar for the very detailed report on enrolment.

The Chair noted that the next two items, which were committee reports, had been moved up the agenda because of their connection to priority items for Senate discussion. Also members of these committees, that were not sitting members of Senate, had been invited to attend the meeting.

b) Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee 2015-16 report and discussion
(attached)

S. Landry, the Chair of the SPAC, spoke to the report and stated that the committee met three times a year. S. Landry thanked the members of the SPAC that were attending Senate that evening. He stated that a long meeting was held in March at which time the 150 Tier 1 and Tier 2 scholarship recipients were discussed and reviewed.

S. Landry noted that the report listed the activities of the committee. He stated that he had been asked to attend Senate in order to give an overview of the Tier 1 scholarships and the rankings that were used. He explained that the Tier 1 scholarships would be for students with a high school average of 95% or higher. In addition to these there were a number of other scholarships such as the Board of Governors Scholarships, the President's Scholarships, the Irving Scholarships and IB Scholarships. Some of these scholarships had specific criteria towards Arts or Science and tended to be in a range of \$5,000 - \$60,000. SPAC reviewed student CVs and reviewed their extra curricula activities and leadership skills in addition to the marks for these scholarships.

S. Landry reported that 2450 students were offered admission last year and that of those, 30% were in Arts, 30% were in Professional Studies and 40% were in Science. 1323 students were offered scholarships and these were spread as follows:

- 26% to Arts
- 28% to Professional Studies
- 46% to Science

S. Landry noted that 229 offers of top scholarships or Tier 1 scholarships were made and that these offers were spread as follows:

- 12% to Arts (42 students)
- 14% to Professional Studies (51 students)
- 23% to Science (136 students)

S. Landry noted that a detailed analysis was being carried out but that it was not yet available.

A. Quema would have preferred to have this information prior to the Senate meeting in order to have time to process the information.

J. Hennessy asked whether the percentages described related to offers and not acceptances. S. Landry confirmed that this was the case.

R. Perrins stated that he had served on SPAC for 10 years and that in the past when applications came in a formula was used to look at high school grades and rank for the top students. The committee would then decide how far down the list to go. There was also an amount of equity money for Arts and Professional Studies.

S. Landry agreed that little had changed. 50% of the ranking was decided by a student's Grade 11 and 12 marks, after which the committee chose the top 150 applications. These would be divided into three groups of approximately 50 each.

R. Perrins asked whether at this stage the equity money had already been factored in.

S. Landry agreed that this was the case. He also pointed out that some of the big awards (President's Award, Irving Award etc.) could be offered to students that were not at the Tier 1 level.

P. Abela felt that there was a structural aspect as to how the Tier 1 students were identified and felt that in the initial capture stage it would be harder to get a high school average of 95% in the Arts than in Science. He felt that the current approach would favour the science students.

S. Landry pointed out that all high school students were required to take an English course and have it included in their average marks. He agreed that Arts students would probably have more Arts courses than a Science student.

S. Ahern noted that of the top 150 files there were far fewer Arts and Professional Studies students. They were being filtered out earlier in the process of selection. He noted that the equity provisions did not come in until the final stage, when only the top 150 students were being considered.

A. Kiefte asked whether high school ranking of students was included.

J. Noel Walsh stated that schools were no longer allowed to rank their students. The Department of Education no longer allowed this.

A. Kiefte asked why the SPAC could not allocate entrance scholarships that better reflected the relative distribution of students coming into Arts, Professional Studies, and Science.

S. Landry stated that this would involve changing the way in which the scholarships were offered, and also raised the question of whether that was the way that Acadia wanted to approach scholarships.

A. Kiefte asked whether the committee had considered different cut off averages for students entering into different Faculties or programs.

S. Landry stated that part of SPAC's five year analysis was taking a look at this type of approach but that it might not be the best approach.

A. Quema asked about the filtering process and whether there was a pre-selection process before the committee started its work. A. Quema asked whether there was comparative analysis going on at present between what Acadia offered to students and what other institutions offered.

S. Ahern stated that the top 150 students were selected completely based on their Grade 11 and Grade 12 marks, so that it was completely numerical. He felt that possibly Science teachers in high school could be giving higher grades, or that the academically stronger students could be going into Science, but that Acadia needed to decide what to do. In his sub-committee they looked at 50 files and seven of the top scholarships went to one department, two went to Arts and three went to Professional Studies. He felt it was possible that Acadia was not attracting the strongest Arts and Professional Studies students.

S. Mesheu responded to an earlier question from A. Quema and stated that a complete analysis had not yet been completed and that until such time as it was, it would be difficult to accurately understand the present situation and what could be done to make changes.

M. Lukeman felt that it would be helpful to know what the acceptance rates were for the three groups of students.

S. Landry did not have that information at this time.

M. Lukeman noted that one of the primary goal of scholarships was to attract students to Acadia. If the statistics showed that one group of students had a particularly high uptake and other groups had a low uptake, it could prove beneficial to change the process in order to get more students.

P. Williams pointed out the need to be careful about the way that the Acadia scholarship program appeared to potential students. It would be possible to have a situation where a student with a 98% average did not get a scholarship while a student with a 94% average received a scholarship.

S. Landry agreed that there were challenges because the schools were no longer able to report their rankings. The committee drew on letters of support when making their decisions.

A. Mitchell stated that when he had been on the committee there was a split between grade assessment and extra curricula activities and he asked what that split was nowadays. A. Mitchell felt that the differentiation in the mix of courses offered by students was not great. Many students did not decide until Grade 12 whether to enter Science, Arts or Professional Studies.

S. Landry stated that the split was 50/50 between grades and reference letters, extra curricula activities and leadership activities.

J. Hennessy asked whether there was an issue with the cut-off being 95%. It would be possible to have a student with a 94% average and excellent extra curricula and leadership qualities that would be the type of student that Acadia wanted to have, but they would not be considered. J. Hennessy's other concern was that if the cohort of academically strongest students were electing to choose Science it would be good to know that because then efforts could be directed in another way to attract the Arts and Professional Studies potential students. J. Hennessy was interested in discovering whether the imbalance was something structural that Acadia was causing.

J. Banks asked what would happen if the cut-off was changed from 95% to 90% when considering students.

J. Noel Walsh stated that about 300 applications would then need to be considered. 48 hours were normally spent over a weekend to assess 150 students at present.

S. Landry pointed out that there were not hundreds of scholarships available to be given out.

P. Williams asked what the gender split looked like.

This was not known.

A. Quema stated that it was very difficult in the Arts to get a 90% mark. She felt that the bar had been set very high for the admitting of students to Arts, with the knowledge that once at Acadia, they would not get a 95% mark easily. A. Quema felt that if she was giving a mark of 95% for a paper it would need

to stand up as a good paper in the Arts and she would not be considering other criteria such as extra curricula activities by the student. A. Quema did not feel that the SPAC looking at other areas besides the marks was addressing the problem of the imbalance between Science, Arts, and Professional Studies.

The Chair had a process suggestion and asked whether Senators had particular questions they wished to put before the SPAC to be considered for this year. SPAC would then be asked to return to Senate at a later date to discuss their findings and continue the conversation.

Motion to refer the discussion to the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee. Moved by R. Raeside, seconded by H. Hemming.

A. Quema asked what this meant and requested that the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee come back at a specific date. She asked when SPAC would have the detailed analysis completed.

S. Landry was not able to give a time frame but hoped that within a month or two the data would be available. He also stated that the SPAC would need to have specific questions from Senate.

A. Quema asked who was providing the analysis.

J. Noel Walsh stated that she would be providing some of it and that some would be generated by Duane Currie.

H. Wylie pointed out that these questions were already very much on the committee's radar. Detailed research was going on at present in order to understand and address structural asymmetries and that for that reason the motion was redundant.

C. Visser proposed that the motion be dropped and that Senators with specific questions address them to the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee.

R. Raeside preferred that the motion be tabled.

A. Quema wished to continue the conversation and asked that the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee members come back to Senate at a future date to show the results of their analysis. A. Quema felt that as the comments of Senators had been minuted the SPAC could refer themselves back to the minutes once they were approved.

MOTION TABLED.

The Chair noted that the SPAC had already indicated that they were in the process of gathering the sort of in-depth information that Senate was requesting and that the discussion held at Senate was also the discussion that members of SPAC were engaged in. The Chair stated that a second invitation would be extended to SPAC to attend Senate in the not too distant future in order to continue the conversation.

B. Anderson suggested to the committee that they consider the values that underpinned the decision making. If grades were considered to be of the highest value that would factor in the decision making. If gender distribution, extra curricula or other things were considered to be of more importance than that would also be the basis for the criteria. Otherwise the criteria may not

align with what values were felt to be important.

The Chair thanked the members of SPAC for attending Senate and for participating conscientiously in the discussion.

- c) Academic Integrity Report from 2014-15, report for 2015-16 and discussion document (*attached*)

The Chair noted that a discussion document had been provided by D. Holmberg but that D. Holmberg was unable to attend due to illness.

The Chair pointed out that D. Holmberg had discussed the framing document with S. Potter, Chair of the Academic Integrity committee and had outlined her key concerns.

S. Potter spoke to the reports from the Academic Integrity committee, from both last year and for the coming year. S. Potter noted that the committee met on a number of occasions last year. In 2008/09 the AIC at the time had discussed making changes and S. Potter noted that many of the changes suggested at that time were now under discussion again and that the suggested changes in the framing document were also along the same lines as the original requested changes.

S. Potter explained that last year the committee was to review Senate's current academic integrity policy and processes and decide whether anything needed to be changed. Committee members were not able to find agreement as to whether the policy needed to be changed, especially with regard to consequences that are imposed by different professors and departments, for similar infractions. The student rep on the committee was concerned about the lack of consistency between different departments and another committee member felt that academic freedom was being threatened by possible changes to the policy.

S. Potter referred Senators to D. Holmberg's document, explaining that she felt that setting a common university policy was the best solution. She did not feel that a policy set by the University would be an infringement on her academic freedom. This would be the most open, transparent, consistent, and fair way to deal with the issue. D. Holmberg noted that she followed a number of other common university policies to do with grading, examinations etc. She preferred to be able to pass on evidence of plagiarism to the committee and have them make the decision. D. Holmberg felt that it went against natural justice to have the same person (the professor) decide whether there was evidence of a problem, decide what the penalty should be and impose the penalty. She felt that it would be much fairer to have a third party see the evidence and decide. This would avoid students being put into very awkward situations, should they have to take other courses with the same professor.

P. Williams agreed that this was a natural justice problem and stated that he would like the committee to consider the issue, noting that it was important to make the student understand what they had done. Cases against students for either plagiarism or cheating needed to be watertight otherwise they would not hold up in court. He disagreed with the suggestion that it was within the purview of his academic freedom to decide that he would not worry about academic integrity. P. Williams felt that academic integrity was a community value.

S. Potter agreed that students needed to know what plagiarism was and

understand that it was different from cheating. Some students felt that by changing every third word in text that was not theirs they were not committing plagiarism. Her approach was to get the students to do the Library tutorial so that they were clear about what plagiarism was.

A. Quema agreed that as teachers in the classroom there were responsibilities to address the grey areas that existed for students. Differences in disciplines meant that there would be different approaches when it came to showing a student what was meant by committing plagiarism. If the committee was working on this issue it could create a document with a reference to how plagiarism would be approached in different disciplines.

A. Mitchell stated that in Science many students had access to science manuals which were written in a language of their own. It would be helpful to have someone on the committee who was familiar with the language of a science manual.

R. Perrins suggested that guiding principles be developed in order to educate students, rather than punish them. He also suggested that the committee look at best practises that other universities had.

S. Potter confirmed that the committee had looked at policies of all the small universities in Nova Scotia in addition to similar sized universities elsewhere. Most of these had a policy that was much more detailed than the Acadia policy.

A. Kiefte pointed out that at the beginning of term the faculty always receive a message from Accessible Learning Services that can be pasted onto the end of a course outline. She suggested that a similar statement of an academic integrity policy could be placed at the end of a course outline and would then be a consistent message.

S. Potter agreed that this had been a recommendation during the 2009 review. Psychology already did this in addition to their own policy statement.

P. Abela agreed that the issue of Academic Integrity was a community value in that it was something that all faculty shared. If it was to go to a single policy and a single disciplining body that investigated and passed judgements, it would be important that the body was appropriately sequestered from other institutional pressures. In multiple instance of plagiarism it was important that a student eventually be dismissed and there could be competing interests at that time with respect to the institution not wanting to loose students.

S. Potter agreed that this was a very good point and noted that the intention was to educate rather than punish.

J. MacDonald had experienced plagiarism at another institution and had been relieved to have been able to hand 'echeat.com' issues on a particular student over to another body to deal with the expulsion of the student.

S. Potter agreed that faculty were very much on their own at the moment when dealing with a cheating or plagiarism situation. It was often hard to know what to do in these situations and difficult to get students to admit that they had cheated.

The Chair noted that 6:00 p.m. was approaching. The VP Academic had asked

to move the Report on Budget Actuals for 2014-15 to the November Senate meeting.

The Chair noted that reports from the Senate sub-committees were expected to be very brief and asked whether Senators wished to continue for a further 20 minutes in order to receive them all.

It was agreed that discussion on the academic integrity issue should continue first.

Motion to refer the issue of Academic Integrity policy back to the Academic Integrity sub-committee of Senate, in order for them to develop a more fulsome policy, in light of the considerations minuted in the October 13th Senate discussions of academic integrity.

Moved by P. Williams, seconded by J. Hennessy.

S. Potter noted that this was the first time that she had chaired a Senate sub-committee and asked whether it was necessary for votes on a decision reached during discussion to be decided by a majority; or whether it was necessary to have consensus by all committee members.

Senators confirmed that a majority vote was all that was needed.

A. Quema pointed out that any recommendations coming from the committee would anyway be brought to Senate for approval.

H. Wyle requested clarification on the wording of the motion. He also stressed the importance of Senate coming up with clear and concrete directives to the Academic Integrity committee. H. Wyle's sense was that very little discussion had occurred at this point and that there had not yet been much of an exchange on what was a very complicated issue. He highlighted the difficulty of trying to cover two special topics during a Senate meeting. Senate directions to the committee were currently very vague.

H. Wyle felt that some sort of compromise would be needed between the issue of natural justice and the issue of academic freedom, and that it was important to understand where that compromise would be, and how it would work structurally.

S. Potter felt that it would be helpful if the motion specified what the academic integrity policy should do in terms of a process.

P. Williams noted that this was being discussed because one committee member did not want to cooperate on changes to the policy. However, he trusted the Academic Integrity committee to come up with recommendations and did not feel that it was necessary to provide them with details especially as minutes of the Senate meeting were available to the committee.

A. Quema also suggested making use of the minutes which were there to help the committee members. She noted that if there was a clash on the committee over the issue of academic freedom, it would be good to also bring to Senate the position of the minority on the committee so that Senate could see what the position was on academic freedom in relation to academic integrity. In this way Senate could also consider this side of the issue.

A. Mitchell agreed with P. Williams that Senate could not give the committee directives and stated that he was quite comfortable with the committee bringing recommendations back to Senate.

H. Wylie responded that what he had intended was that Senate provide the Academic Integrity committee with a concrete path as to how to consider the issue. H. Wylie pointed out that this issue had come to Senate because the committee had found itself at an impasse and not able to complete their work. H. Wylie suggested that if Senate was going to come up with a university wide policy it would be necessary to be careful about the sort of absolutes that were laid down. He felt that a certain measure of academic freedom would need to be built into that structure because natural justice could lead to other kinds of injustice if context was ignored.

MOTION CARRIED.

- d) Reports from Senate sub-committees

Motion to receive the remaining reports of the Senate sub-committees at the November meeting of Senate. Moved by R. Perrins, seconded by J. Banks.

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion to adjourn at 6:20 p.m. moved by J. Banks.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

Graduation List to be approved at the Senate Meeting, October 13, 2015

Doctor of Ministry

VanderMolen, Geoffrey Alan

Master of Arts in Theology

Rafuse, Donald Ralph

Master of Divinity

Dorey, Joshua

Bachelor of Theology

Brightman, Patrick James Gordon

BETHEL BIBLE SEMINARY

Master of Divinity

Cheung, Chi Ping

Chow, Kin Kei

Ho, Tsz Yan

Ip, Mei Ling

Ip, Yi Man

Lai, Shui Ying Esther

Lam, Fung Yee

Lau, Yuk Ying

Lin, Big Wan

Mak, Po Sham

Tong Wai Yee, Dicky

Wong, Kin Ming

Wong, Ming Hoi

Yau, Lai Yuen

Master of Arts

Wong, Yan Chung

Master of Theological Studies

Chan, Chi Chung

Duan, Yao Gang

Ho, Cheuk Ying Winnie

Ip, Man Him Jeffrey

Lam, Ping Sum

Lau, Yin Ling

Luk Cheuk Fai, Raymond

Lum, Yu Ying

Mok, Lai Mei

Ng, Tsz Wah Fani

Ng, Wai Fong

Soo, Chung Wai

Szeto, Miu Kuen 2

Wan, Lai Chun
Wong, Dik Man Alex
Yuen, Wing Yan Morris
Yeung, Yuk Ying

Master of Arts in Theology

MacPhee, Ginger Marie (Political Science)
Woolaver, Katelyn Esther (Sociology)

Bachelor of Arts with Honours

Quesnel, Alexander Richard (History)

Bachelor of Arts

Armstrong, Joseph
Barry, Mikhail
Doyle, Brian James
Durepos Boudreau, Tommy-Charles
Fletcher, Alexander
Lampe, Frank John
Landry, Juan-Marco
MacGillivray, Mark William
Marner, Matthew Philip
Morrow, Nicole R
Myhal, Kirsten
Pae, Caitlin

Bachelor of Music

Mott, Andrew

Certificate of French Proficiency

Amirault, Lorraine M
Comeau, Clara Louise
Demedeiros, Stephanie Clare
Doroshenko, Daniel
Ells, Carole Anne
Elson, Heidi Kristine
English, Kaitlin Emma
MacCuspik, Chantelle Francine
Pulley, Vanessa
Reid, Amanda Nicole
Stinson, Julie Avalon Humphreys
Younes, Sara

Master of Science

Alamer, Huryyah (Chemistry)
Aljaroudi, Zainab (Chemistry)
Atwater, Misty-Dawn Elizabeth Anne (Chemistry)
Azam, Md Saroer-E (Computer Science)
Baccardax, Anne Catherine (Psychology) 3

Balzer, Andrew (Mathematics & Statistics)
Iqbal, Mohammed Shameer (Computer Science)
Jiang, Xiang (Computer Science)
Jones, Hillary Dorothy (Psychology)
Keyser, Freya Maryanne (Biology)
LeBlanc, Nathalie Marie (Biology)
MacQuarrie, Robert David (Applied Geomatics)
Porskamp, Peter Hendricus Johannes (Biology)
Power, Jason (Biology)
Puthanveetil Maliakal, Tariq S (Chemistry)
Slaman, Lisa Rose (Geology)
Thomas, Mark Donald John (Mathematics & Statistics)

Bachelor of Computer Science

Cooper, Timothy Andrew
Francis, Keegan Lee
Shi, Yucheng
Shu, Qianli

Bachelor of Science

Barry, Sean Alexander
MacAskill, Jeanette Marie
Viertelhausen, Colin Benedict

Bachelor of Applied Science

McArthur, Matthew
Mounla, Robin
O'Toole, Benjamin Colin

Certificate of Applied Science

Alkhalaf, Ali Abdrabalredha H
Alsahli, Khalid Eid K
Mounla, Robin
Walsh, Caitlin Briana

Honours Conversion

Abbott, Janice Lorraine (Nutrition)
Acton, Kelsey (Nutrition)
Chung, Christina Mei Te (Nutrition)
Jones, Alexandra Donna (Nutrition)
Lee, Nyssa Shi (Nutrition)
Reid, Tara-Lee (Nutrition)

Master of Education

Alexander, Sandy Christine (Inclusive Education)
Allen, Heather Ann (Curriculum Studies)
Barry, Amy Lynn (Counselling)
Bradfield, Nancy Brooke (Counselling)
Brown, Jennica Lynn (Counselling) 4

Buchanan, Lindsay Meaghan (Curriculum Studies)
Buttenaar, Krista Margritta T (Curriculum Studies)
Caldwell, Kathryn L (Inclusive Education)
Calnen, Scott Wayne (Curriculum Studies)
Cameron, Esther Leanne (Counselling)
Cann, Michelle Jean (Counselling)
Corkum, Chantel Wendy (Curriculum Studies)
Crowley, Sheila Joan (Counselling)
Davis, Jodi Lynne (Curriculum Studies)
Duffy, Melanie Dawn (Curriculum Studies)
Edwards, Janelle Louise (Curriculum Studies)
Garrison, Jeanette Louise (Inclusive Education)
Gloade, Katharine Ruth (Counselling)
Guy, Paula Marie (Counselling)
Heinrichs, Marika (Counselling)
Higgins, Cheryl Lisa (Counselling)
Hill, Mark Clyde (Inclusive Education)
Hopfe, Chelsie Dawn (Curriculum Studies)
Jollymore, Peter Craig (Curriculum Studies)
Judson, Malcolm Brett (Inclusive Education)
Keddy, Julie Dawn (Counselling)
Lavery, Brenda Pauline (Leadership)
LeBlanc, Christopher Aaron (Counselling)
Levesque, Jennifer Nicole (Inclusive Education)
MacLennan, Jacqueline Nicole (Inclusive Education)
Macmillan, Heather Ann (Counselling)
Mader, Trisha Joanne (Inclusive Education)
MaGee, Sara Danielle (Inclusive Education)
McCarthy, Stephanie Marilyn (Inclusive Education)
McCormack, Sarah (Curriculum Studies)
McGarry, David Allan (Curriculum Studies)
McMeekin, Reagan Dale (Inclusive Education)
Meagher, Adelle Marie (Curriculum Studies)
Murphy, Traci Lee (Counselling)
Myers-Stuart, Kimberley Ann (Counselling)
Nowostawski, Vanessa Carolyn (Curriculum Studies)
Noylander, Andrea Lea (Counselling)
Oxford, Natasha Lynn (Curriculum Studies)
Pon, Ken (Leadership)
Purchase, Jeffrey Edward (Counselling)
Randall, Lindsay (Inclusive Education)
Reardon, Donald Peter (Leadership)
Romeo, Bernadette (Counselling)
Rudolph, Ainslie Gail (Curriculum Studies)
Seymour, Leisha Lillian Munro (Counselling)
Shea, Karri Justina (Curriculum Studies)
Sims, Jennifer Margaret (Counselling)
Smith, Ashley Maria (Inclusive Education)
Smith, Claire Catherine (Counselling) 5

Smith, Julia Rebecca Victoria (Counselling)
Spidle, Regina Marie (Counselling)
Thompson, Margaret Michelle (Counselling)
Turnbull, Mary (Curriculum Studies)
Welton, Lynn Marie (Counselling)
West, Tena Marie (Inclusive Education)
Wever, Diane Audrey (Curriculum Studies)

Bachelor of Business Administration

Bukhari, Khalid Abdulhafiz
Cai, Peisi
Campbell, Brett
Carter, Alexander Hansen
Chen, Zhijiang
Chun, Sangwon
Du, Sihao
Feng, Chi
Groves, Brady
Hastings, Jenna
He, Zhaozhuo
Hicks, Theodore Evan
Jaber, Ameer
Kindra, Gurangad Singh
Nurullah, Zubayed
Reibeling, Sean
Sidney, Brandon
Su, Qihua
Wang, Qianyu
Wearing, Robert
Xiong, Qianyun
Ying, Zexiang
Yuan, Wei

Bachelor of Kinesiology

Frost, Kyle
Wagner, Brian

Bachelor of Recreation Management

Tanner, William

Bachelor of Community Development

Belsey, Julia Sila Desiree

Enabling Motion

Any candidate for an Acadia degree, diploma or certificate who should receive a grade or otherwise qualify or be disqualified between this Senate meeting and the Senate meeting in April, may, if circumstances require, be considered by the Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standing Committee, the appropriate Dean, the appropriate Head/Director, and the Registrar, acting as an ad hoc committee of Senate, they having the power to make consequential amendments to the graduation list. Any such amendments to the list shall be reported to Senate at the next Senate meeting.

ACADIA UNIVERSITY

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

REPORT DATE: September 30, 2015

SPAC COMMITTEE CHAIR

Scott Landry will chair the committee to June 2016.

MEETINGS DATES

The committee will meet in person and via email.

The committee met in person on September 29, 2015.

Additional meetings for the 2015-2016 year are expected to be held in:

November 2015

Early March 2016

April 2016

Several other meetings may be held between the SPAC Chair, Secretary, and Manager of Scholarships & Financial Assistance to decide upon various awards and matters as needed.

The Bursary & Loan Committee of SPAC will meet weekly throughout the academic year as needed. Two meetings have already been held.

PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

The committee will be reviewing the purpose and duties as listed below at the November meeting.

1. To decide policy and process by which winners of scholarships, prizes, bursaries and awards are to be selected and to gather all information it considers necessary for the selection;
2. To select the winners of all undergraduate scholarships, prizes and awards;
3. To periodically investigate the scholarships, prizes and awards program and to recommend improvements (increased funds, new scholarships, more prizes, etc.) to those involved in the program;
4. To promote interest in the scholarship program by posters, letters and other means;
5. To consider such other matters as the Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Entremont
Secretary

Scott Landry
Chair

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE

Annual Report to Senate for 2014-2015

April 29, 2015

Committee Members 2014-2015

Dr. Susan Potter (Chair), Pure & Applied Science

Mr. Derek Serafini, Registrar

Dr. Stephen Ahern, Arts

Dr. Jason Holt, Professional Studies

Ms. Pat Townsend (Sept – Dec, 2014), Ms. Anne Smith (Jan – Apr, 2015), Library

Mr. Connor Thompson, student representative

In October, 2014, Derek Serafini reported that the committee would focus on the following this year:

1. A review of Senate's current academic integrity policy and processes (i.e., does anything need to be updated or changed?).
2. A review of Senate's academic integrity policy and processes vis-à-vis faculty- and department-specific policies (i.e., are there differences in how infractions are penalized across departments, schools, and faculties? Are expectations and penalties clear to students?).
3. A review of the central registry of infractions (do we need to start collecting additional data points? How should we use the data we collect? How and to whom and when should the data be reported?, etc.).

The Academic Integrity Committee met three times: October 2, October 31, and February 13. We made good progress on the tasks outlined above.

Item #1 was focus of discussion in all three meetings. There was disagreement among members of the Academic Integrity Committee with respect to whether the current policy was fine or in need of revision. One of the main issues of contention was how to address the wide range of consequences that are imposed by different professors and departments for similar infractions (e.g., from "don't do it again" to a grade of zero on the test or assignment) while at the same time protecting academic freedom. In examining this issue, the academic integrity policies of other NS universities as well as primarily undergraduate universities in other provinces were reviewed. Many universities have policies that are more detailed and specific than Acadia's although others are similar. The committee could not reach a consensus with respect to whether or not to revise the current policy. The importance of educating students about academic integrity was discussed and it was noted that the library has some excellent resources including an award-winning video designed to explain different forms of cheating and plagiarism, but it is not known how many students are aware of these resources. Encouraging the use of plagiarism software/websites such as Turn-it-in was also discussed. During the last meeting there was discussion about the possibility of developing guidelines to assist professors and departments in dealing with academic integrity violations, including suggested penalties and reporting procedures, without turning the guidelines into formal policy. This topic is complex and the committee plans to continue to work on it.

In addressing item #2, the Chair of the Academic Integrity Committee contacted all department heads and asked for any policies/guidelines they have for dealing with student infractions. Based on the information collected, each department handles infractions differently. Some departments have written documents that outline specific penalties and are included with course outlines, others have informal policies, and many have no policy; in most cases, academic integrity violations are handled by individual faculty in their own courses. The student representative on the committee felt that in many cases, penalties are not clear to students.

With respect to item #3, the central registry of infractions is currently held by the office of the registrar. When an academic integrity infraction is reported to the registrar, the incident is documented and the student's name is added to the list. When a student commits an infraction, in determining what penalty to impose, professors/departments can check to see if that student has committed previous infractions. The Academic Integrity Committee continues to discuss how to address the questions regarding the documentation of academic integrity infractions.

Respectfully submitted by Susan Potter, Chair

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE

Plans for 2015-2016

October 5, 2015

Committee Members 2015-2016

Dr. Susan Potter (Chair), Pure & Applied Science

Dr. Jeff Banks, Acting Registrar

Dr. Stephen Ahern, Arts

Dr. Jason Holt, Professional Studies

Dr. Paul Arnold, Engineering

Ms. Anne Smith, University Librarian (Acting)

Ms. Carlie Visser, student representative

The Academic Integrity Committee held its first meeting of the fall term on October 5th, 2015.

There have been some changes in the membership since the last meeting. New members include: Jeff Banks, Acting Registrar (replacing Derek Serafini), Paul Arnold, and Carlie Visser, student representative (replacing Connor Thompson). New members were apprised of the current state of discussion and progress with respect to the issues the committee has been actively engaged in addressing over the past year. The questions that the committee will focus on this year include:

1. How can the current academic integrity policy be improved (in terms of the way infractions are penalized, the communication of expectations and penalties to students, for example) without infringing on academic freedom?
2. Further review of the central registry of infractions; consider developing a policy regarding the registry taking into consideration factors such as FOIPOP legislation.

The committee will attempt to meet at least twice each term; more meetings will be scheduled as needed.

Respectfully submitted by Susan Potter, Chair

Background / Context Information for Academic Integrity Discussion at Senate

Disclaimer: This information was prepared by D. Holmberg, and the contents might reflect her own personal biases. Others are most definitely welcome and encouraged to add further information and differing perspectives during the Senate discussion!

Background / Context

- Acadia University's current Academic Integrity Policy appears on page 53 of the 2015-2016 Academic calendar, available on-line here: http://registrar.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/registrar/pdfs/Academic_Calendars/calendar_final.pdf. Senators are encouraged to bring a copy of this current policy to the Senate meeting, for reference.
- The policy has not been changed in any substantive way (i.e., anything other than minor wording or formatting changes) since 2004/2005.
- There were apparently some proposed changes discussed in 2009. The committee revised the policy and circulated it to Senate; it was discussed at length and received feedback (see the May 2009 minutes, available here: http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/senate/Minutes/2008/13Apr09.pdf). However, the proposed changes do not seem to have ever been voted on or incorporated into the calendar, although some aspects (e.g., the Registrar maintaining a record of offenses) have been implemented in practice, without being explicitly noted in the policy.
- After that, the Academic Integrity Committee seems to have stopped meeting / functioning for a number of years. There were no further annual reports to Senate until October 2012 (see http://senate.acadiau.ca/tl_files/sites/senate/Minutes/2012/9Oct2012.pdf). At that meeting, the committee recommended they be disbanded, stating that: (a) input from unit heads showed that units had appropriate procedures in place to deal with academic integrity that fit their discipline; (b) the Registrar circulates information to all faculty members each fall reminding them of the importance of the issue, and the appropriate procedures; (c) any further issues or concerns could be addressed by the Admissions and Academic Standing (Policy) Committee. Some Senators expressed concern, and did not feel the committee should be disbanded. No further action to disband the committee was taken.
- The committee has met several times in the last two years. According to the Chair (S. Potter), there was a difference of opinion amongst committee members, with some thinking the current system is perfectly fine, allowing maximum flexibility and academic freedom. Other committee members saw problems with the current system and wanted to review it. The committee was unable to reach consensus as to whether a review should be undertaken. They did contact unit heads and found that most units did not have any policies beyond what is stated in the University calendar (there are exceptions, and some profs may have individual policies).

Potential Concerns

Again, please note that some faculty members like the system exactly as is, so these concerns are not shared by all. However, some concerns with the current policy have been noted:

- The current policy is not very specific regarding what does and does not constitute cheating and plagiarism. Students often report, apparently with full sincerity, that they did not realize a certain behavior was problematic, and that they had engaged in it before in many other classes with no problem. Other institutions spell out much more fully on their websites exactly what constitutes a

violation. The Library does have some excellent tutorials; students can be encouraged to take these, but there is currently no way to document whether or not they have done so.

- In a related vein, deciding what constitutes a violation of the policy, whether a violation has occurred in a particular instance, and what the appropriate punishment should be, is largely left up to individual instructors. Different rules can apply in different courses, and very different penalties might be applied for identical offences. Other institutions have committees that review the evidence presented, and determine the appropriate punishment, according to institutional guidelines.
- In determining appropriate penalties, some faculty members like to know if the student has a record of previous offences. If offences are reported to the Registrar's Office, they do keep a record, and will report the details of any previous offences at a faculty member's request. However, students are not always informed of the existence of this record, and there are no clear guidelines regarding who has access to it. Current practices might very well violate FOIPOP guidelines.
- If students are unhappy with a faculty member's decision in a particular instance, they have the right to appeal the issue to the head/director, the Dean, the VPA, and the Senate Committee on Academic Discipline. Any of these bodies can overturn the faculty member's decision, and elect to apply a different penalty, or none at all. There is then no recourse for faculty members to appeal at any stage, if they disagree with the decisions of those bodies. This lack of an appeal process can potentially lead to threats to academic freedom, if professors have their best judgement overturned, with no possibility of recourse.

Next Steps?

- Senate might decide the current policy is perfectly fine as is and no review is needed.
- Senate could request the committee review the policy in light of these concerns and others, and recommend changes.
- These recommendations might come in the form of a standard university policy; a default university policy that would apply unless professors spelled out any exceptions clearly on their course outlines; or a requirement that all professors should clearly spell out their own personal policies on their course outlines (with appropriate support from higher levels, if the evidence supports that students have violated a policy that was clearly articulated on the course outline).