



Draft Minutes of the Senate meeting of Monday 14th September, 2015

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 15th September, 2015 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Ann Vibert presiding and 39 present.

- 1) Approval of Agenda **Motion to approve the agenda. Moved by B. Anderson, seconded by D. Benoit.**

MOTION CARRIED.

- 2) Minutes of the Meeting of 16 June, 2015 **Motion to approve the Minutes of Tuesday 16th June, 2015 as distributed. Moved by R. Raeside, seconded by C. Rushton.**

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

G. Bissix requested that on Page 4, paragraph two, *‘D. Seamone stated that Environmental Science was the only program ...’* be altered to read *‘D. Seamone stated that Earth and Environmental Science was the only program ...’*.

H. Wyle asked that on Page 8, paragraph six, *‘the Chair stated that that D. Holmberg ...’* be corrected to read *‘The Chair stated that D. Holmberg ...’*.

H. Wyle requested a change on Page 4, final paragraph, which currently reads *‘A. Quema also suggested that in advocating for an inter-disciplinary approach to knowledge there was nothing to prevent Acadia from establishing an inter and administrative structure.’* It was agreed that this should read *‘A. Quema also suggested that in advocating for an inter-disciplinary approach to knowledge there was nothing to prevent Acadia from establishing an inter-disciplinary administrative structure.’*

G. Phillips pointed out that on Page 8, paragraph 8, *‘The Chair responded that Senate would be meeting next week ...’* should in fact read *‘The Chair responded that Senate Executive would be meeting next week ...’*.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS AMENDED CARRIED.

3) Announcements

a) From the Chair of Senate

Regrets were received from J. Cayford, D. Green, P. Connelly, L. Aylward, D. MacKinnon, H. Hemming, R. Perrins, P. Williams and R. Murphy.

The Chair introduced herself to the Senators and thanked D. Holmberg who developed the *Handbook for Senate Chairs*.

The Chair noted that R. Densmore and W. Brackney would be arriving late.

The Chair welcomed new Senators and others returning to Senate: P. Abela, D. Holmberg, H. Kapoor, M. Lukeman, J. MacDonald, E. Patterson, G.

Poulter, A. Quema, P. Rockwell, A. Loder (student Senator), C. Visser (student Senator) and B. MacDonald (graduate student Senator).

The Chair also noted that she would not vote on motions unless there was a tie, and that in that instance she would generally vote against the motion but would reserve the right to vote in favour of the motion if there was a tied vote on a motion that sent the original motion back to a Senate sub-committee or the original mover for clarification.

The Chair announced that an orientation session for new Senators would be held in BAC 132 on Monday September 21st, 2015, commencing at 4:00 p.m. All Senators were encouraged to attend but the Chair particularly extended the invitation to new Senators.

The Chair stated that she had circulated an email to all Transitional Chairs of Senate committees in the first week of September requesting that they confirm the Transitional Chair and asking that they call their committees together to elect a Chairperson and decide on their agenda for the coming year.

The Chair reported that Senate Executive had met twice during the summer, on June 24th and July 8th. Two items were discussed at these meetings, the first of which concerned modifications to Senate Committees that was approved at the April meeting of Senate. B. Anderson (outgoing Chair of the By Laws committee) met during the summer with the Chairs or Transitional Chairs of the relevant committees to request that they draft language to describe the changes in membership and mandate of these committees. These drafts will come forward to the By Laws committee for review, before coming to Senate in the form of *notice of motions* in the early Fall. The Chair reminded Senate that there were recommendations to merge the Faculty Development committee and the Academic Technologies committee into one Faculty Support committee. The Admissions and Academic Standing committee (Appeals) was to change to an Ad hoc committee, as was the Academic Discipline Appeals committee. The Curriculum committee was to be divided into a Curriculum (Policy) committee and a Curriculum (Administration) committee. The Chair noted that the process of drafting motion was on-going.

The second item at Senate Executive pertained to the Senate Executive White Paper which was discussed at the June meeting of Senate. The Chair noted that the outcome this item was later on the agenda and could be discussed at that time.

The Chair stated that the next meeting of Senate Executive would be on September 28th 2015.

b) From the President

The President reported on three items, the first of which was the broad based bi-lateral relationship between the Province of Nova Scotia, the education system and Acadia itself. The President discussed the three program reviews that were established last year. He noted that the review of Nutrition and Dietetics (led by B. Anderson) was the furthest along and was close to a draft report from the working group which would feed through to the Government. President Ivany stated that the questions to be looked at were defined in the terms of reference, but that potential remedies or follow on actions were not defined. President Ivany commented that the second review, originally referred to as the Teacher Education Review, had now morphed into

something different. As a result of the Freeman Review it was no longer the Department of Labour and Advanced Education that would be taking the lead on the review. The Department of Education would now be focusing on aspects of the Freeman Review that had made a number of recommendations with respect to pre-service preparation of teachers in universities offering teacher education, and the effect of that on the quality of P-12 education. This was a fundamental change.

President Ivany noted that the other reviews were framed as a dual partnership between the Department of Labour and Advanced Education and the Universities that were involved in the process. In the case of Education, the lead Government agency would now be the Department of Education which would serve as a body to advance the work that was defined in the Freeman Review.

President Ivany stated that the Engineering review had just got started and that it was being led by Dalhousie. A consultant had been retained to carry out the work, but President Ivany pointed out that site visits to the Universities were essential. He expected that this review should proceed quickly and that the preliminary work should be finished by the end of this calendar year and that the report should be filed by the end of the first quarter of 2016.

President Ivany had been reporting regularly to Senate on these three reviews because even without knowing the possible outcome, the nature of the reviews had the capacity to influence what may happen in the future. President Ivany reminded Senate that a similar review in the 1990's did result in significant program change in a number of Nova Scotian universities.

President Ivany's second point was related to five Government/Institution working groups: Entrepreneurship, Experiential Learning, Recruitment and Retention, Research and Development, and Technology Enabled Learning. President Ivany stated that he co-chaired the Research and Development working group with Richard Florizone, President of Dalhousie University. Membership was generally about 50/50 but slightly over-weighted towards the institution side. The intent was to advance what Nova Scotia was doing in those thematic categories described above. The output was less defined but President Ivany believed that the output from at least one of the thematic committees would feed into the next round of the Memorandum of Understanding process with the Government.

President Ivany stated that final enrolment numbers would be available in October but that an enrolment drop had been seen this year. This would require a campus wide budgetary review process to look at ways to cope with the situation. President Ivany pointed out that over the last six years enrolment had increased by 27% in spite of declining demographics, but that some of that increase had now been lost. It was important to ensure that this was a one year blip. The intention to level off enrolment numbers remained but it would first be necessary to regain the lost ground.

President Ivany's third point related to MPHEC. A decision had been made by MPHEC that the request for a change of name from the *Master of Recreation Management* to the *Master of Community Development* had not been accepted as a minor change. President Ivany noted that the proposal would have been circulated to sister institutions in the Maritimes and that they would have been asked to comment on the name change.

President Ivany read the ruling from MPHEC which requested that an external review of the Master of Community Development be carried out, following which Acadia would resubmit its program proposal, using the information requirements for new graduate programs.

D. Benoit asked whether numbers were down for first year classes across the Province.

President Ivany stated that not much information was yet available but that St. FX had been publicly indicating that their enrolment numbers were strong. He expected that other institutions could have flat enrolment numbers and that some others could experience declines. All institutions submit enrolment reports on October 1st.

A. Quema asked President Ivany whether he understood the reason for the enrolment drop at the institutional level and also if he could explain whether all Faculties had been affected.

President Ivany stated that at the October meeting of Senate he would be providing a detailed report with the assistance of the Registrar and S. Mesheau. He stated that despite a healthy increase in applications to Acadia something happened in February to prevent applications converting to registrations. President Ivany stated that some knowledge could be gained from phone call campaigns.

G. Poulter passed on congratulations to the Administration for the way that they had dealt transparently with the recent sexual assault case on campus. President Ivany extended thanks but also noted that an additional charge had now been laid against the individual.

G. Bissix stated that at the start of term he received email from a student indicating that their athletic coach had insisted that they attend practice rather than class. G. Bissix noted that this directive put the student athletes in a difficult position and he asked who authorized that action.

G. Bissix was approached by another student athlete who was requesting that an Independent Study be set up for him because he could not attend class as practices were scheduled for the same time slot.

G. Bissix also noted that, for professors dealing with experiential teaching, the extension of the Add/Drop date to allow students to add classes 10-11 days after the start of term was very problematical. G. Bissix hoped that the dates for Add/Drop could be reconsidered by Senate.

President Ivany offered to get an explanation of the circumstances of the first two points raised by G. Bissix, noting that the early start date for the Fall term had created a number of challenges. President Ivany suggested referring the third point to the VP Academic for further discussion by the Deans.

c) From the Vice-President Academic

J. Hennessy provided a report from the three Faculties, forwarded to him by R. Perrins.

Faculty of Arts: In the Department of Sociology the kNOw MORE campaign is an educational campaign geared to promote a nuanced understanding of “consent” within all relationships – men-women, men-men; women-women; queer-queer.

The NO MORE component will focus on misinterpretations around consent, for example “NO MORE thinking it was okay,” or “NO MORE blurred lines.” The kNOw more component focuses on education, an example is “kNOw MORE about enthusiastic consent.”

The know more challenge is a challenge from Acadia’s varsity teams to all varsity teams nation wide to start a kNOw MORE campaign at their universities. The goal is to create a healthy sexual environment on all campuses across Canada. The campaign stemmed from a research project in sociology with Dr. Zelda Abramson. The campaign has gained wide media attention. In May, Global television interviewed students.

The kNOw MORE challenge which was held on Labour Day received good coverage. On Thursday Vicki Archer and Alexandre Dodier were interviewed live on CBC Mainstreet Halifax. The challenge was covered by CBC national and provincial news and aired on TV Monday night and was featured on Information morning Tuesday morning.

During the challenge event on Monday, the students ran one of the Athletics stations organized for the varsity teams where all the varsity athletes participated in photos, videos and most importantly discussion on consent and sexuality. Nora Allen (honours sociology) will be releasing a series of youtube videos.

In the Department of Languages and Literatures last year the German section became a Canadian representative for the so-called SEAGULL (Smart Educational Autonomy through Guided Language Learning) Initiative, which is a €500 K project sponsored by the European Union for the promotion of international partnerships in language teaching/learning. This project also includes a database of materials that can be used for the partnerships. The role of the partners is to disseminate information about this project. In particular, Christian Thomas presented a paper on it together with Henning Grashoff (PAD) at the World Language Congress in Ontario in March 2015.

The Department of Economics will host the 43rd Annual Atlantic Canada Economics Association Conference, October 23-25, 2015 in Wolfville, NS.

Faculty of Professional Studies: In the School of Business the Patterson Hall and the Twenty Wing Project became a reality as the School of Business officially moved into Patterson Hall two days before first year students arrived on campus. While moving to Patterson has been a goal for over a decade, fundraising for the completion of Patterson Hall began in earnest in the Summer of 2013 with funds raised in the area of \$ 2.2 million through donations by business alum and friends of the Business School. Dr. Ian Hutchinson Director was intimately involved with identifying and often meeting with prospective donors as well as our Office of Advancement and is recognized as a central figure in the success of this initiative.

In the School of Kinesiology Dr. Jonathon Fowles was an invited participant at the Canadian Senate Committee - *Social Affairs, Science and Technology* - May 28th where the report on the increasing incidence of obesity in Canada: causes,

consequences and the way forward was examined. Professor Saïd Mekary a new tenure track hire in Kinesiology has been awarded an NSHRF Development/ Innovation grant for funding (\$15,000 for 1 year). This project is in collaboration with Dr. Derek Kimmerly at Dalhousie University. Their project is titled: "Blood Vessel Health: Influence of Ageing and Aerobic Fitness".

Faculty of Pure and Applied Science: In the School of Nutrition and Dietetics the Partnership between the School and Acadia Athletics has brought on board as advisors: recent graduate and former varsity Women's Basketball player, Lindsay Harris (now working as a dietitian with Nova Scotia Health); Susie Langley, Acadia Graduate ('61), honorary degree recipient ('09) and sports nutrition expert; Dr. Matt Durant, School of Nutrition and Dietetics faculty member, to develop an evaluation plan; and Michelle Wood, Women's Volleyball Coach. All will support the work related to nutrition education being completed with Acadia varsity sports teams. Over the past three weeks, fifteen workshops on hydration and nutrition have been provided to four teams by volunteer nutrition students, with direction from Professor Liesel Carlsson, Elliott Richardson, Head Strength and Conditioning Coach, and Lindsay Harris. In addition, nutrition was added to the Athletics Retreat in August, attended by all coaches. The teams receiving workshops include Men's and Women's Soccer, Men's Football, and Women's Rugby; other workshops will be provided to all-year and winter sports teams later in the semester and in the winter term. The plan is that this nutrition support for varsity teams will become the lab component of a sports nutrition course when there is a capacity to offer an upper level course on this topic.

Acadia WISE (Women in Science and Engineering): One action to address the priority of mentoring of WISE students, identified at an October 2014 gathering, is a fall event called **WISE Works!** This two-hour session, being held on September 29th from 4:30 to 6:30 pm in the Fountain Commons, will include a plenary by Acadia Alum Dr. Deb McClatchy (Vice-President, Academic & Provost, Laurier University) followed by opportunities for students in attendance to talk with WISE alums representing a variety of careers. Set up in a speed-meeting style, it is anticipated there will be a great deal of interest in the more than 15 careers included. A WISE faculty Planning Group has been active in working out the details for this event, and communication about WISE Works! has already begun on campus. Funding to support the event was secured from the Acadia University Alumni Association, which is very much appreciated. More details are available on the WISE Acadia website and Facebook page.

Dr. Peir Pufahl was in Brazil with Dr. Noel James (Queens University) investigating massive phosphate deposits.

Drs. Ian Spooner and Mark Mallory were in the Field at the Beaubassin field station with Biology and ENVS graduate and undergraduate students looking at nutrients and metals in waterfowl habitat.

Dr. Alice Cohen was in Northern Canada investigating water policy issues.

Dr. Sandra Barr was in Cheticamp, the Cobequid Mountains and throughout New Brunswick solving the riddle of the evolution of the Appalachians!

Dr. Svetlana Barkanova was elected as President of the CAP Division of Theoretical Physics.

Dr. Michael Robertson became President of the Microscopical Society of Canada for 2-year terms starting June, 2105.

J. Hennessy also announced that eight full-time faculty positions had been authorized for 2016. Two of these were for full-time Librarians and six were for tenure track positions. The positions were as follows:

Sociology/Women and Gender Studies
Nutrition
Kinesiology
Psychology
Earth and Environmental Science/ESST
Biology/Math

A. Quema commented on the sense of cohesiveness between what the Administration was doing in terms of transparency and what the faculty were doing: examples being the kNOw More campaign and the WISE Works project.

R. Worvill asked whether the tenure track position for Economics was over and above the eight positions that had been mentioned.

J. Hennessy confirmed that this was correct and that the position had been previously authorized.

The Chair let Senators know that she would generally refer to them by their first names rather than by titles.

J. Banks had announcements that were the result of the enabling motion in May. This allowed for students to graduate during the summer from the 16 month B.Ed. program in Education. J. Banks reported that 38 B.Ed. students had graduated in the month of August and that list will be added to the Minutes.

J. Banks also reported the following changes to the Spring convocation list: Patrick James Gordon Brightman was removed from the Bachelor of Theology. John Alexander Merchant was added to the Certificate of Applied Science. Li Ang was added to the Bachelor of Business Administration.

J. Banks stated that Kathleen Heather Smith and Emily Ann Eva Peck were added to the Master of Science, and that Shannon Eileen McCaustlin was added to the Master of Education (Counselling); all in August.

4) New Business

- a) Senate Executive White Paper – detailed follow up from summer meetings (*attached*)

The Chair provided a summary of the background to the item. After the June Senate meeting when it was felt that Senate dealt with a lack of substantive issues, the Senate Executive prepared a list of potential topics for consideration by Senate during 2015-16. The process decided upon was that the list of potential topics would be distributed to Senate members for consideration and comment, and that a Senate amended version of the list be forwarded to Senate sub-committees to consider as they were setting their agenda priorities for the coming year. All sub-committees are already asked to

report their priorities to Senate at the October meeting which provides an opportunity for Senate to select a list of core topics for the academic year. The Chair asked whether other members of Senate Executive wished to add any comments.

A. Quema pointed out to Senators that the intent was to stimulate thinking and encourage Senators to discuss and add to those topics rather than to take over the process. Anne emphasized that the intent was not for Senate Executive to dictate to the sub-committees.

The Chair agreed that the intention was to follow up on the June meeting of Senate and engage in some brain-storming. She asked Senators whether there were any questions or comments on the list.

G. Bissix suggested an addition to the list. G. Bissix and D. Benoit were invited to NSCC to attend a meeting on “One Nova Scotia” which was a follow up to the Ivany Report. G. Bissix noted that a number of individuals were charged with following up and putting into practice changes in six subject areas, one of which was the role of college and university sectors in Nova Scotia. G. Bissix felt that this process may have a large impact on the future of colleges and universities and on their enrolment. G. Bissix felt that it would be worthwhile for Senate to have an active discussion around the proposals.

G. Bissix noted that there were 50-60 people invited and that they were asked to comment on their preliminary proposals. He expected that the feedback would be incorporated into the proposals. G. Bissix emphasised that he felt that the role of universities, humanities and social sciences were under represented and noted that the discussion was centered on technology and business. G. Bissix felt that Senate or the Board or both should give this topic consideration once One Nova Scotia came out with their proposals.

The Chair asked whether G. Bissix would continue to be involved in the discussions.

G. Bissix understood that workshops would be held and that later the conversation would be broadened. G. Bissix felt that the U-4 was a unique niche for Acadia and needed to be argued for.

G. Bissix felt that once One Nova Scotia went public with their proposals Senate as a body should sit down and talk about any possible implications.

The Chair felt that part of this could fit under bullet point #8 which was related to the larger context of how the university was operating these days, and how the operation impinged upon the future of programs.

J. Hennessy asked how Senate would decide in which order to look at these topics. He requested that bullet #2 *Equitable distribution between Faculties of Tier I Scholarships* be discussed at Senate in October.

J. Hennessy suggested that in 2014-15 Tier I scholarships distribution was 10% Arts, 20% Professional Studies and 70% Pure & Applied Science. In 2015-16 the distribution was 12% Arts, 15% Professional Studies and 73% Pure and Applied Science.

M. Lukeman asked whether J. Hennessy could explain what he meant by Tier I, asking whether these were entrance scholarships or on-course scholarships.

J. Hennessy was not clear but felt that this was a large scholarship. He stated that there were various tiers of scholarships and that Tier I would be the highest amount that a student could receive.

A. Quema had participated in the Steering Committee in the Faculty of Arts that considered this perceived inequity and suggested that it would be helpful to hear from the Scholarship, Prizes and Awards committee so that Senate could have a conversation about this.

H. Wylie stated that part of the concern in the Faculty of Arts was that scholarships were awarded on the basis of marks and that there was a suspicion that there was a structural inequality, because the possibility of achieving extremely high marks in sciences was possible, compared to the arts and social sciences where grades of 95-100 were virtually impossible.

P. Abela felt that a large untapped market could exist for arts students and that if more scholarships were available a number of arts students might be encouraged to attend Acadia.

A. Mitchell pointed out that he used to chair the Scholarships, Prizes and Awards committee and similar concerns existed at that time. M. Leiter produced a document proving that the entering English grade for the arts students was in fact lower than the entering English grade for the science students. A. Mitchell did not feel that in High School students specialised sufficiently to be considered either a science or an arts student.

B. Anderson commented that it was valuable to uncover what some of the issues might be before the topic went to the sub-committee. She reminded Senate that discussing issues such as these as a “Committee of the Whole” had been discussed: this would uncover potential issues to be sent back to a sub-committee, and also clarify what issue needed to go to what sub-committee.

J. Banks noted that last year the By-laws committee had done a lot of work to bring forward recommendations about committee mergers and changes in status (standing or ad hoc). J. Banks noted that there was quite a difference between the way that the various sub-committees operate, some with a clear mandate, some with a mission statement, some with duties and some without duties. He preferred to see a more consistent structure for the committees. When duties were too prescriptive it was easy for a committee to get bogged down.

A. Quema felt that some of the topics were quite obviously suitable for certain sub-committees. However, the mandate of the new Curriculum committee had not yet been decided and some of the bulleted points would relate to this new committee’s mandate. A. Quema asked whether Senate could begin to identify topics that would go to this committee.

The Chair stated that Senate Executive had identified likely committees for each of the topics to be targeted towards. The process Senate Executive had in mind was to bring these to Senate to invite possible additions and to then send these topics out to the chairs of the various sub-committees. Those sub-committees will be bringing their agendas for the 2015-16 year to Senate in October.

President Ivany felt that it was possible to get caught in a reductionist model at times, when an individual policy comes through to Senate as a piece of individual business. Seen altogether the policies did add up to something but Senate tended to discuss each policy without really discussing the big picture. President Ivany gave as an example, the follow on effects of Government policy on the funding formula and the overarching issue; which was the space that Acadia occupied in terms of a rigorous liberal education in a highly personalized setting. Acadia was constantly dealing with threats to that model but President Ivany noted that it was important to start with a strong affirmation of the model itself. During the 2007-08 period when the Government policy was being created, President Ivany could find no mention in the Senate minutes of Acadia responding to the Policy and making a statement as a whole, which might have resulted in a different set of policies being created. President Ivany felt that these large tranches of work were harder to deal with, but that Senate could certainly pick one or two to be pursued. The bulk of the process time tended to be spent on routine business which squeezed out time for the 'bigger picture' items.

J. Stanley reflected that many years ago he was one of the student Senators at Acadia. He recalled one of the activities of Senate at that time was a committee process arounds the academic goals and objectives of a liberal arts institution. J. Stanley noted that Senate has dealt with these issues from time to time over the years.

G. Gibson suggested that one topic that could be added to the bulleted list would be a general discussion about where Acadia wanted to be in 10-15 years. This sort of open discussion would help Senate to identify some of the issues that G. Bissix raised earlier and also enable Acadia to react more quickly to Government policies.

The Chair noted that a number of these discussions were related and fell into a category of 'where we are, who we are and where we were going', and that this could be added to the list of topics.

The Chair also noted that Senate Executive had discussed the fact that when these topics came to the floor of Senate as motions, it would be helpful if there was a framework and a preamble provided, to give Senators the background. The Chair stated that this approach would pick up the larger background and relate it to the specific topic and help to enable a deeper conversation.

G. Bissix felt that there was a danger of getting bogged down in the details and that it was important to discuss general principles at Senate. He gave as an example to importance of discussing what the slot system should enable faculty to do, rather than Senate discussing in detail what was wrong with the slot system.

D. Holmberg noted that in Senate Executive there had been a discussion about the difficulty of getting concerns of individual faculty or the university body to the Senate sub-committees for discussion. Committee members would not necessarily know that there were problems. D. Holmberg cited the Academic Integrity committee membership as an example.

Q. Phillips felt that the big issues needed to be discussed, as did the smaller topics that would go on to sub-committees for action. G. Phillips agreed that a discussion about where the University was going needed to be held at Senate.

The Chair noted that there was no necessary contradiction between the details and the big picture. Details could be grappled with in the form of motions, but that there were not clear processes for how to move the larger discussions forward. Senate was indicating that it wanted to engage in both the smaller process type actions and the larger issues.

A. Quema pointed out that having framed the discussion for Senate it would be good for Senate to commit to further discussion on one or more of the topics before finishing the evening. A. Quema asked what approach might be taken to ensure that items were either discussed over the next several months, or should some issues be passed straight on to a sub-committee.

D. Benoit felt that Senate needed to be discussing the topics so that it could provide direction to the sub-committees and make clear what the wish of Senate was with regard to possible changes. Without direction from Senate, a sub-committee could move off in another direction. D. Benoit felt that without using this approach, the sub-committees were being given the role of Senate, while they were working in an isolated fashion and were without the ability to see the big picture.

L. Murphy agreed and asked what would be discussed first, noting that some were more time sensitive and others would take longer to discuss.

D. Holmberg suggested picking a smaller item and a larger item for the next few Senate meetings and giving a dedicated 30 minute time slot devoted to discussion. Sub-committees could be invited to attend Senate to hear the concerns. The sub-committee could then be asked to go away and work on the issue and report back to Senate in a certain time frame.

M. Lukeman felt that bullet #4 item 'Mandate of the New Curriculum Committee (Policy)' could be discussed immediately as it currently had no mandate.

The Chair pointed out that the minutes of the April meeting of Senate recorded the fact that this committee did have a mandate, in so far as the Curriculum committee (Administration) was taking over point one of the mandate, while Curriculum committee (Policy) was taking over points 2-5 of the original mandate. Senate intended that the memberships of those committees shape the wording of their mandates, rather than Senate dictating a mandate to them. Once the committee had decided upon the wording, this would go forward to the By-laws committee.

B. Anderson stated that this was the intention and this process was underway.

D. Holmberg asked whether all of the sub-committees would be presenting their plans for the 2015-16 year at Senate during the October meeting.

The Chair confirmed this but stated that not all sub-committees would be ready at that time. These topics could feed into the process of committees reporting to Senate in October.

L. Murphy felt that if none of the items on the bulleted list were more time sensitive than others, perhaps three of the items in the bulleted order could be added to the Senate agenda in October.

The Chair felt that some of the items had been outstanding for longer and should be identified.

D. Holmberg preferred to get started with a discussion on academic integrity during which the committee members would be invited to attend the Senate meeting.

H. Wyle agreed with this approach and recommended trying one topic at first. He reminded Senate that this document offered potential topics and was very invitational and plastic in nature. Other Senators had already offered additional ideas. H. Wyle felt it would be good to think about what was important and about what should be considered in a broad way.

H. Wyle agreed with the Chair who had expressed reservations about the way in which the process might unfold. He agreed that it would be very helpful to have some framing, and suggested that a Senator might volunteer to provide framing on a particular item for discussion.

D. Holmberg offered to volunteer to get some background on the topic of Academic Integrity onto the Senate agenda because that had been identified by her unit as an area of concern.

M. Lukeman felt that the Academic Integrity sub-committee should be invited to attend Senate for the discussion. Similarly, discussing Tier 1 Scholarships without the Awards and Scholarships committee being present, would not be productive.

A. Quema agreed that it was important to have a sub-committee be present but also noted that in the case of for instance, the T.I.E. committee, a large number of the members were not Senators, which was part of the problem. A proper representation of the sub-committee members would need to attend the Senate meeting, not just the Senators on a committee.

A. Quema felt that the question of scholarships was very pressing because recruitment would be starting for 2016-2017.

The Chair offered to add both the Academic Integrity issues and the Tier 1 scholarship issues onto the October agenda and stated that both of these committees would be invited to attend Senate.

The Chair was also intending to send the larger list of potential topics to other relevant sub-committees.

D. Benoit suggested that Senate consider the timelines for some of these changes. Changes to the slot system could not be considered in November because it would be too late for the current academic year. D. Benoit asked that Senate Executive consider the timelines that would be needed for each committee to complete their work on a topic, noting that it could take two years for the TIE committee to complete work on the slot system.

D. Benoit acknowledged that the Tier 1 scholarship issue was something that needed to be solved for this year.

B. Anderson felt that many of the conversations would be linked into the proposal to discuss 'where Acadia wanted to be in 10 years'.

D. Holmberg noted that a number of the bulleted topics were a natural fit for the Curriculum committee so that the sooner that committee membership and mandate got decided, the better.

The Chair expected that the makeup and mandate of the Curriculum committee would be coming to the October Senate meeting.

G. Phillips noted that the suggestion of a common credit a six hours of English had been raised in the past and she felt that a discussion about the importance of Arts and Humanities across all Faculties was needed.

It was agreed that Academic Integrity and Tier 1 scholarships would be discussed in the October meeting of Senate.

J. Banks pointed out it was too late at this stage to make changes to the slot system for 2015-16.

J. Banks noted that the Faculty Development committee and the Academic Technologies committee will be merging to form the Faculty Support committee and discussing what the new mandate should be. This conversation would take place in October.

J. Stanley felt that the selection of one of the larger topics was important and that care should be taken to ensure that time was devoted to discussion of these larger items.

The Chair asked whether a larger topic should be paired with the Academic Integrity discussion, keeping in mind that the October Senate agenda was quite busy.

G. Gibson suggested that Senators break into smaller groups to discuss and then map their points altogether. 15-20 minutes would be needed for this exercise.

D. Holmberg suggested setting aside time during the November meeting of Senate to discuss the topic of 'where Acadia wanted to be in 10 years.'

G. Bissix felt that if Senate were able to carry this out, it would appear relatively revolutionary when compared to many other Senate bodies across the country.

M. Lukeman stated that this sort of a conversation would also have an impact on the Academic Planning committee.

D. Holmberg suggested that the APC be invited to the November Senate meeting.

A. Quema stated that Tier 1 scholarships spoke to the way in which Acadia valued its Arts students and also what the place was of Arts students in the Institution. This would be an important conversation to have. A. Quema asked whether the conversation on a particular topic could be broadened to include the above concerns.

The Chair agreed that this was quite possible.

Motion to adjourn at 6:00 p.m., moved by G. Bissix.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

The documentation below was given on June 2, 2015

Removed

Bachelor of Theology

Brightman, Patrick James Gordon..... Centreville, NS

Added

Certificate of Applied Science

Merchant, John Alexander..... Halifax, NS

Bachelor of Business Administration

Li Ang..... Hangzhou, ZheJiang, China

The following students were graduated in the month of August:

Master of Science -

Smith, Kathleen Heather (Psychology) – August 11, 2015

Peck, Emily Ann Eva (Psychology) – August 21, 2015

Master of Education

McCaustlin, Shannon Eileen (Counselling) – August 12, 2015

Bachelor of Education – August 7, 2015

Alguire,Ryan Arthur

Amirault,Andree Lucille

Berry,Alyssa

Bitar,Silvana

Bradford,Stephen Michael

Carmichael,Meaghan

Connell,Jenna

Corkum,Kristen Emily

Craig,Tyler

Currie,Christopher James

Dahr,Shalene

Dodge,Mathew Alexander

Durette,Jennifer Alicia

Esquivel Perez,Laura Rebeca

Hall,Jennifer Lynne

Isenor,Lauren

MacMillan,Tessa Caye

MacNeil, Jennifer Lauren Maria
Malloy, Kirsten Elizabeth
Matheson, Dawn-Marie
Moore, Jessica Lynne
Morse, Lauren Catherine
Morton, Emma Lee Olivia
O'Reilly, Christina Nicole
Orrell, Floyd James
Potter, Breagh Kinnon
Rajab, Adam Evan
Samson, Hughie Kevin
Shillington, Kellie
Stevens, Jamie Charles
Tanner, Daniel Patrick
Tanner, Moira Patricia
Thompson, Daniel
Tucker, Thomas Paul
Wadden, Liam Melvin
Walkinshaw, Ashley Elizabeth Ann
Walkinshaw, Lacey
Wolfe, Morgan Vale

Senate Executive: Follow Up to the Executive White Paper (June, 2015)

Preamble:

At the July 8 meeting of Senate Executive, the Executive followed up on the agenda item “Senate Executive White Paper “ from the June 16, 2015 Senate Meeting. Specifically, the Executive addressed the matter raised in the June Attachment 6) a) “Senate Discussion Paper,” and discussed at the June Senate meeting, of a perceived lack of engagement at Senate of larger academic issues important to the academic core and future of the University. In order to contribute to establishing a re-engagement of “big issues” discussion at Senate, the Executive brainstormed a preliminary list of potential topics for consideration at 2015/16 Senate meetings, the topics be forwarded to Senate members for the September meeting, and members invited to add to/revise the list. The preliminary topics list is also intended to be forwarded to appropriate Senate sub-committees for consideration, the sub-committees encouraged to select issues to tackle and to report their determinations at the October Senate meeting, so that Senate may then prioritize topics for the year. Ultimately, the aim is to support and encourage discussion of at least one academic item of substance at each Senate meeting, in the form of a motion proceeding either from Senate sub-committees or from individual Senators.

The list of potential topics identified by Senate Executive is as follows:

- Consistency of minors and majors and the number of required hours
- Equitable distribution between Faculties of Tier 1 Scholarships
- Processes for putting in place course enrolment restrictions
- Mandate of the new Curriculum Committee (Policy)
- Review of the level of 1st, 2nd or 3rd year courses and whether there are differences
- Consideration of a common requirement of 6 credit hours of English across the campus or a collection of writing intensive courses approved by Senate
- Continued work on changes to the slot system, including consideration of differential credit hours
- Consideration of mechanisms/processes for degree and program changes, including program closure
- Consideration of academic integrity issues and whether changes to the current policy would be desirable.