

To: Senate
From: Nominating Committee
Re: 2017-2020 Triennial Review Report
Date: 7 July 2020

Background

As senators are aware, every triennium the Nominating Committee solicits comments from senators, senate committees, and members of the campus community on Senate's operations. A website (<https://senate.ubc.ca/2017-20-vancouver-senate-triennial-review>) was established earlier this academic year to provide background information and inform submissions. Broad feedback was welcomed; however, to focus comments on tangible areas for improvement, the Nominating Committee suggested that submissions consider the following questions:

- 1) Is the current size and composition of Senate appropriate, and is representation suitably balanced between groups?
- 2) Do the Rules and Procedures of Senate effectively support Senate's functions on behalf of the University?
- 3) Do Senate committees have appropriate mandates and terms of reference to aid Senate in academically governing the campus?
- 4) Does the Senate have sufficient resources to fulfill its mandate?
- 5) Do Senate committees have appropriate sizes and compositions?
- 6) How can the Senate improve its communication with the campus?
- 7) How can Senate better ensure that all its constituent groups (e.g., convocation members, deans, faculty members, senior administrators, students) are engaged in its work?
- 8) Do you have any feedback regarding the Council of Senates?
- 9) Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

In response to that general call and specific prompting by the Secretary to Senate committees, several dozen submissions were received. The Committee appreciates all of the comments, and recognizes the effort and consideration that went into raising issues and proposing potential improvements and solutions to the Nominating Committee. In most triennial reviews, the Nominating Committee has been able to, by consensus, agree on recommendations to the Senate. With this review, that has not been possible and a number of formal votes were held to resolve recommendations. The Committee notes that as a result, regrettably, all of its members are not in favour of all of these recommendations. This has almost always been not due to a disagreement on a situation being an issue, but rather has been due to disagreement on either the efficacy of a proposed solution, or a sense that a proposed solution will cause greater problems than the proposed solution. The Committee regrets that it cannot find unanimity, and hopes that these types of issues can be further examined by the proposed external review below.

The Senate Nominating Committee would recommend that Senate resolve as follows:

That Senate approve the recommendation in Part 1 (External Review) of this report;

That Senate approves the recommendations in Part 2 (Committee Terms of Reference Amendments) of this report;

That Senate approves the recommendations in Part 3 (Committee Composition Amendments) of this report;

That Senate approves the recommendations in Part 4 (Amendments to the Rules and Procedures of Senate) of this report; and

That Senate approves the recommendations in Part 5 (Recommendations to Committees and Officers of the University) of this report.

Part 1: External Review

Recommendation: External Review of Senate

“That the Senate support in principle that a review or reviews of the operations of the Vancouver Senate be arranged for the 2020-2023 triennium, with such terms of reference and other details to be recommended by the Senate Nominating Committee, after consultation with the Secretary, to the 2020-2023 Senate no later than October 2020.”

Throughout this review, the Nominating Committee heard several comments, most vocally from the student members of Senate but also from several faculty members, that it was time again to conduct a fuller review of Senate’s operations, such as was last done in 2005 with the “Report of the Ad Hoc Committee for the Review of Senate”. That may take the form of an external review (such as the Senate requires for academic units) or a series of reviews of discrete areas of operation with various external experts and consultants as the subject areas require. The Committee is also mindful that the world is still currently in a pandemic, and typical external review procedures are being adjusted as a result. Finally, the Committee is aware that this may be a costly exercise for the University and thus work over the next term will be required to properly scope and cost out such an exercise. Thus, at this time it is recommending approval in principle and instruction for the next Nominating Committee to review and consider the detailed implementation of such a review.

Throughout this triennial review, a number of topics arose that the Nominating Committee would suggest be considered in a broader review. These include:

The internal organization of the Senate, including its committee structure, committee leadership, and the rules and procedures of Senate;

Involvement and Engagements of the various estates that form the Senate’s membership (i.e., faculty, students, administrators, members of the convocation, and others) in its work;

Senate Membership, including issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion; (keeping in mind the limitations and requirements of the *University Act*);

Operation of appeals and quasi-judicial tribunals;

Senate Resourcing and Staffing;

Scheduling of Senate and its Committees

The involvement of Senate in strategic planning at the university-level

Enforcement/implementation of senate decisions and rules

The Nominating Committee is not suggesting that the above should be taken as an exhaustive list.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Part 2: Committee Terms of Reference Amendments

Recommendation: Senate Agenda Committee Terms of Reference

“That the terms of reference for the Senate Agenda Committee be amended to add the following

‘To advise the Secretary on the orientation program for new and returning members of Senate.’”

At present, the orientation of new senators is coordinated by the Registrar. The Committee agrees with that approach but would suggest that a committee of Senate also have formal responsibility for that process.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Senate Curriculum Committee Terms of Reference

“That the terms of reference for the Senate Curriculum Committee be amended to add ‘and life-long learning’ following ‘continuing education’”.

The Senate Curriculum Committee originally proposed adding “extended learning” in place of “continuing education” as one of its terms. The Nominating Committee believes that an update in diction would be beneficial, but notes that “continuing education” is the term used in our enabling legislation, the *University Act*. In consideration of the desire for a broader term and continuity with our constitutional documents, the Nominating Committee would propose “continuing education and life-long learning” as a compromise.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Senate Tributes Committee Terms of References

That the terms of reference for the Senate Tributes Committee be amended as follows (next text in bold, removed text struck through):

To consider persons who are suggested to the Committee or whom it considers to be suitable recipients for honorary degrees, and to make recommendations to Senate.

- *To ~~recommend to Senate emeritus status in appropriate cases.~~ **make recommendations to Senate with respect to emeritus status.***
- *To prepare a statement regarding deceased members of Senate to be recorded in the minutes.*
- *To consider **matters related to regalia and academic dress** ~~colours for new degree programs,~~ and to make recommendations **thereon** to Senate.*
- *To consider rules governing procedure for the transaction of business by the convocation **and at congregation ceremonies,** and to make recommendations thereon to Senate.*

The Tributes Committee has suggested several changes to their terms of reference to more accurately reflect the kinds of decisions it recommends to the Senate. Specifically, these changes provide better clarity as to the Committee's role and function with respect to decisions around emeritus status, academic regalia and congregation ceremonies at UBC's Vancouver Campus, including anticipation of some of the decisions that may require its deliberation in the coming years. The Senate Nominating Committee largely agrees with the suggestions made, with one modification (rather than replacing "convocation" with "congregation", the committee recommends both words be used as while "congregation" is the historic term at UBC, "convocation" is the word used in the *University Act*.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Part 3: Committee Composition Amendments

Recommendation: Enlargement of the Senate Academic Policy Committee

"That the membership of the Senate Academic Policy Committee be expanded by three senators, one of whom must be a student."

The Nominating Committee would note that the Academic Policy Committee is often one of the busiest at Senate, and also one of the most requested for committee assignments. To better support the Committee's work and to allow for greater participation, the Nominating Committee would recommend that three additional members be added to the current 13 members of the Academic Policy Committee. In keeping with usual practice regarding ratios from various estates on Senate, the number of seats reserved for student members of Senate is also recommend to be expanded from two to three.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Agenda Committee Membership

“That the membership of the Senate Agenda Committee be expanded to add the chairs of the Senate Teaching & Learning Committee and the Senate Research & Scholarship Committee as voting members ex-officio.”

Presently, the Agenda Committees membership is two student members of senate, one convocation member of senate, one dean, and the chairs of five other standing committees of Senate (Academic Policy, Admissions, Awards, Curriculum, and Nominating). These five were originally selected as they were the five that tended to generate most business on Senate agendas. Since that time, the Teaching and Learning Committee has become more active, and Senate has established a new Research & Scholarship Committee. In consideration of their work, the Nominating Committee believes that the chairs of those committees should also be added to the membership of the Agenda Committee so as to better coordinate the work of Senate committees and the Senate.

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Appeals on Academic Standing Committee Membership

“That the membership of the Senate Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing be expanded by three senators, one of whom must be a student.”

The Nominating Committee would note that the Appeals on Academic Standing Committee is often one of the most arduous and time-consuming Senate Committees. In consideration of that, the Committee often hears matters via panels of five senators chaired by its chair or a vice-chair. To better support the Committee’s work and to allow for greater participation, the Nominating Committee would recommend that three additional members be added to the current 11 members of the Academic Policy Committee. In keeping with usual practice regarding ratios from various estates on Senate, the number of seats reserved for student members of Senate is also recommend to be expanded from three to four. The Nominating Committee would note that it did consider more substantive revisions to the membership of the appeals committee; however, due to a lack of consensus for a change it determined that this topic would be better considered as part of the external review recommended in Part 1.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Part 4: Amendments to the Rules and Procedures of Senate

Recommendation: Training for Appeals Committee Members

“That the Rules and Procedures of Senate be amended as follows:

That the following new section be added following the current Section 28:

No member of the Senate Committee on Student Appeals of Academic Discipline, the Senate Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing, or the Senate Admissions Committee shall hear an appeal until they have attended any training program that may be required by the respective Committee from time to time.’ And

That all subsequent and referential section numbers be renumbered accordingly.”

The Nominating Committee agrees with a concern that the current Rules and Procedures of Senate do not mandate attendance at the quasi-judicial training provided for members of the appeals committees generally either by outside legal counsel or the Justice Institute of British Columbia, and that such training may not be offered frequently enough given changes in committee memberships, especially for student members. The Nominating Committee agrees that such training must be mandatory, and further agrees that for members who join mid-term, the Registrar must make alternate arrangements for their training prior to such a member participating in hearings.

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Committee Chair Term Limits

“That the Rules and Procedures of Senate be amended as follows:

That the following new sections be added following the current Section 42:

‘## All Senate committees shall elect a chair and a vice-chair from amongst their members who are senators at least triennially.’

‘## Except for the Senate Agenda Committee and those committees established to ensure representation on the Council of Senates, no senator shall chair more than one standing committee of Senate.’

‘## No Senator shall serve as chair of a standing committee of Senate for more than six (6) consecutive years’ and

That all subsequent and referential section numbers be renumbered accordingly.”

The Nominating Committee deeply appreciated the effort and experience of senators who have chaired committees for many years. That said, it has also heard a concern that some committees have grown complacent in their leadership over many years with the same chair, and that a forced renewal from time to time would help bring new ideas to the forefront without the awkwardness of removing a long-serving and appreciated chair in an election. The Committee agrees that renewal from time to time would be in the interests of Senate. The Committee also heard a suggestion that committee membership in general should also be term limited; with

respect, the Committee does not agree with that sentiment. While it accepts the argument that leadership of a committee should be held in rotation, to remove experienced members from a committee all together would be too harmful to continuity of work.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Committee Chair Election

That Section 42 of the Rule and Procedures of Senate be amended as follows (new text in bold):

*“42: All Senate committees shall elect a chair and at least one vice-chair from amongst their members who are senators **by secret ballot. Prior to such an election, candidates shall be given an opportunity to address their nomination and answer any questions committee members may have.** Should a committee elect more than one vice-chair, its chair shall determine which vice-chair shall chair a meeting or otherwise represent the Committee in his or her absence.”*

The Nominating Committee would note that while in practice some committee chairs are already elected by secret ballot, this is not mandated by the *Rules and Procedures of Senate* and thus some may currently be elected by resolution. The Committee agrees with the notion of the importance of a secret ballot in such decisions, and further with making explicit the opportunities to speak to and question nominations and nominators prior to an election.

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Senate Committee Agendas

“That the Rules and Procedures of Senate be amended as follow:

That the following new section be added following the current Section 44:

‘## Agendas for committee meetings shall be proposed by committee chairs to their committees for each meeting after consultation with any vice-chairs and the secretary to the committee.’ and

That all subsequent and referential section numbers be renumbered accordingly.”

At present, Senate committee agendas are set by each committee after being developed by the committee chair and secretary. For continuity, training, and further input, the Nominating Committee agrees that Committee vice-chairs should also be involved in that process.

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Senators as Observers at Committees

“That the Rules and Procedures of Senate be amended as follows:

That the following new section be added following the current Section 36:

‘##: Rule 36 notwithstanding, except in the case of the consideration of appeals or if a committee otherwise resolves, all members of Senate are permitted to attend meetings of any Senate committee of which they are not members as non-participating observers. Senators who so attend will be held to the same standards for confidentiality of materials and proceedings as committee members. Observers must inform the secretary of their intention to attend at least 24 hours prior to the meeting and while reasonable efforts shall be made to accommodate all observers, space may be limited due to room capacity constraints.’

and

That all subsequent and referential section numbers be renumbered accordingly.”

Rules 36 currently provides “Attendance at meetings of Senate committees is normally limited to members of the committee. Others may attend only with the permission, or at the request of, the Committee”. The Nominating Committee did hear submissions from the some senators asking for committee meetings to be open to the public generally in the interests of transparency, as well as concerns from committee members arguing that opening the meetings would be harmful to free and open consideration of draft proposals on subjects that may be confidential, to giving preliminary feedback to initial ideas that are not yet in a state for public consideration, and result in members speaking more for external audiences rather than to their fellow committee members. The Committee would note that at the time this rule was set, the decision was made to make Senate meetings themselves as open as possible (of the hundreds of resolutions the Senate considers each year, less than 10 tend to be considered in-camera), and to refrain from generally delegating to committees any final decision-making authority of Senate so that decisions are made in an open forum. Having heard student concerns, which seemed most focused on student committee members not being able to attend meetings due to their class or work schedules, the Nominating Committee is pleased to recommend an exception to the usual closed meeting rule. The Committee recognizes that this does not fully address the students’ concerns.

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Part 5: Recommendations to Committees and Officers of the University

Recommendation: Appeals Procedures

“That the Senate appeals committees be requested to review their procedures for accessibility, and in particular, to consider if greater parity or constituency is warranted between the procedures for academic standing and academic discipline disputes and what timelines and scheduling patterns are used.”

The Nominating Committee has considered a submission noting the differences in procedures between the admissions, academic standing, and academic discipline appeals committees. While it is not common for students to need to avail themselves of any of these processes, let alone multiple processes, the Committee is sympathetic to the idea of being mindful of differences and ensuring that where possible they are purposeful rather than incidental.

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Policy Implementation

“That the Senate Academic Policy Committee be requested to consider amendments to Policy V-1 to address policy implementation and implementation reviews.”

The Committee notes that currently the Senate does not have consistent mechanisms for ensuring or monitoring implementation of the policies, resolutions, and regulations that it passes, nor reviewing such activities. The Nominating Committee agrees that such mechanisms would be useful and suggest that Policy V-1: Format, Development & Administration of Senate *Policies* would be the appropriate tool for such a system.

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Senate Curriculum Committee Approval Procedures

“That the Senate Curriculum Committee be requested to review its sub-committee structure and any internal delegations of final approval authority.”

The Senate Nominating Committee received a submission from one senator suggesting that the Senate Curriculum Committee’s delegation of powers to its Graduate Sub-Committee (which has the same membership as the Graduate Council’s Curriculum and New Programs Committee) should be reconsidered. Not knowing the details of the concern, the Nominating Committee would ask the Curriculum Committee to consider the matter further.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Senate Diversity

“That the Registrar and the Council Elections Committee be requested to take whatever reasonable steps they feel appropriate to encourage as many candidates as possible - especially those from diverse backgrounds - in Senate elections and encourages all member of the UBC community to do the same, and that the Registrar and Council Elections Committee report back to the Senate with their considerations of this matter by the end of the 2020-2021 academic year.”

The Nominating Committee notes that it received substantive recommendations from the several sources regarding a variety of areas around equity and diversity, including on appeals panels, on Senate, and on its committees. The Nominating Committee thanks those who made these

suggestions and greatly values the diversity of our campus community. At this time, it notes that Senate is primarily an elected body with elections primarily conducted on the basis of faculties. Under such a system, there is no way of ensuring that ethnic, gender, or other identity factors (other than academic discipline) are ensured election to Senate without broader changes to the Senate membership. The committee strongly recommends that this be an area of focus for the review recommended in Part 1 of this report.

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Teaching and Learning Committee Membership and Curriculum Committee Membership

“That the Senate Nominating Committee consider adding the Director of the First Nations House of Learning (or designate) as an ex officio, voting member to the Senate Teaching & Learning Committee and the Senate Curriculum Committee.

The Senate Teaching & Learning Committee and the Senate Curriculum Committee have considered their membership in light of the various pedagogical and curricular initiatives currently underway and planned to support both the learning of indigenous students themselves and broader academic inquiry into indigenous matters. These committees are of the opinion that a Director would be uniquely placed to participate in deliberations, but recognize the frequent calls upon the incumbent (and her predecessors) to participate in University committees and the draws upon her time and attention (and the draws upon the time and attention of other indigenous members of the academy) by such service. The Nominating Committee agrees with the suggestion in principle but wishes to consult with the director and others on how best to incorporate indigenous perspectives into Senate committee processes.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Committee Chair Training Process

“That the Secretary be directed to prepare a specific training and orientation process for new and continuing chairs of standing and ad hoc committees of Senate.”

The Committee would note that currently, the Senate and committee orientation processes do not directly address the parliamentary, organizational, and procedural skills needed to effectively chair committees of Senate. The Committee agrees that this should be a resource made available to new committee chairs.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Senate Resources

“That the Senate note the concerns raised regarding the staff resources available for the Senate.”

During the course of the triennial review, the Committee was made aware of concerns regarding Senate Secretariat staffing levels and their implications for the work of Senate. More specifically, several Senators, including chairs of standing committees, expressed concern about work overloads for the Secretariat and the effects of that overload on the well-being of staff, the prioritization of tasks, and the timeliness of task completion. We recognize that recommendations about staffing in the Secretariat are beyond the scope of the triennial review, but we think it appropriate to bring these concerns to the attention of Senate. We hope that some consideration will be given to reviewing and adjusting staffing levels, as needed, either as part of an external review or independent of that process.

Recommendation: Senate Office Budget

“That the Senate recommend that the Council of Senates amend the terms of reference for the Council Budget Committee to add to its terms of reference ‘To review the annual budget submission for the Senate Office and make whatever recommendations it sees fit to any office or officer of the University.’”

The Nominating Committee would note that presently, the Senate Office budget is considered by the University as a subset of the Enrolment Services budget under the vice-presidents academic on both campuses. In the past, this has resulted in budget cuts demanded by senior administrators curtailing the ability of the Senate to do its work due to either staff layoffs or substantial cuts to non-salary expenses, generally to provide funding for other initiatives. While the current Associate Vice-President for Enrolment Services has been highly supportive of the work of Senate, and early in her term of office worked to mitigate and, in some cases, reverse the negative effects of earlier budget decisions, the Nominating Committee feels that Senate itself must have more direct input into the process for determining the financial resources need to support Senate’s work, and that the Council Budget Committee, in the course of its legislated duty to “assist in the preparation of the University budget” is the best placed to do so.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Committee Year Plans

“That each senate standing committee prepare and publish annual year plans (outlining what topics the committee expects to consider over the academic year) at their September or October meetings, with the understanding that such plans may change due to emerging issues and developments thought-out the year.”

The Nominating Committee notes that many but not all committees of senate already undertake such a process. The Nominating Committee agrees that the practice would be of value for each senate committee, and also for the Senate Agenda Committee in considering how best to organize the workload of the Senate as a whole.

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Committee Self-Reflection

“That at the end of each academic year, each committee of Senate engage in a self-reflection discussion on its operations and effectiveness over the past year.”

This matter was first proposed to the Nominating Committee as a “review” of each committee chairs performance. While the Nominating Committee found that specific approach to be unduly confrontational, it did agree that committees as a whole should be more reflective on their performance (including the effectiveness of their officers).

This recommendation was not unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest Regulations

“That Senate supports in principle the development and adoption of a formal Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Regulations for Senators; and

That the Senate Agenda Committee be directed to review the work to date and to recommend such a code and regulations to the Senate for consideration by the end of the 2020 academic year.”

The Senate does not currently have a code of conduct outside of the *Rules and Procedures of Senate*. A draft document was circulated to senators last year with mixed replies; some senators felt that this was an appropriate means of controlling the behavior of senators that may compromise the integrity of Senate or its work, others felt that this was a “heavy handed” approach that would stifle the ability of senators to communicate with their constituents and other persons/groups. While the Nominating Committee recognizes the utility of such a code, it also recognizes that the previous draft may have been too legalistic in its approach and could be revised in such a way to support both the orderly operation of Senate as well as the rights of individual senators.

Presently, the University’s conflict of interest policy is maintained by the Board of Governors. While it applies to senators in their capacity as employees of the University (for those who are employees), it does not apply in their capacity as senators nor to those whose only relationship with the University is as senators. The Nominating Committee agrees that this is an issue, and out of respect for Senate’s legislated mandate to govern its own affairs, feels that Senate should continue the development of its own regulations. Feedback provided to the Agenda and Nominating Committee last year was largely supportive of this idea in principle, with some specific concerns around implementation and enforcement that still need to be resolved. The Committee thus recommends support in principle while those concerns are addressed.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Open/Closed Meeting Procedures

“That the Senate Agenda Committee be directed to prepare amendments to the Rules and Procedures of Senate setting out under what criteria the Senate and its committees may meet in camera.”

Section 20 of the Rules and Procedures of Senate currently allows for it to meet *in camera* (a.k.a in closed session). While the Senate has generally refrained from meeting in camera for almost all business, in a few cases in recent years it has, and some members of Senate have questioned what criteria is used or should be used for such decisions. The Rules and Procedures of Senate are currently silent on what criteria should be applied, and the Nominating Committee agrees that this is a deficiency that should be rectified. As a starting point, the Committee would recommend those criteria already used to determine if committee minutes should be kept private. These are:

Discussions and dealings with other entities or persons where disclosure of the information being discussed may compromise the relationship of the University with them or its relationship with its stakeholders;

Labour relations or human resources issues;

Financial, personnel, contractual and/or other matters for which a decision must be made in which premature disclosure would be prejudicial;

Matters which the Senate or the University are required by contract or law to keep confidential;

Matters related to civil or criminal proceedings; and

Personal information related to an individual

To this, there may also be reasonable grounds to keep private, at least for a time, discussions where the University’s strategic or competitive interests may be harmed by public disclosure, politically sensitive topics that may harm the University if not communicated in an appropriate manner outside of the Senate or University, and matters that they Okanagan Senate or Board of Governors may view as requiring confidentiality.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Elections Procedures

“That the Registrar be requested to conduct the triennial review of elections procedures in as open a manner as possible.”

The Committee notes that elections are not under the purview of the Senate under the University; rather, they are conducted by the Registrar under such rules approved by the Council of Senates (which also has a committee serving as the appeals body for elections matters). That said, as part

of the triennial review, several submissions were made regarding elections procedures, and the committee was also made aware of concerns regarding decisions of the University elections staff. The Committee understands that the Registrar already plans to solicit public comments on elections procedures and wishes for the Senate to show support for that initiative.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.

Recommendation: Student Senator Transition Dates

“That the Registrar be requested to seek a further legal opinion regarding the possibility of amending the terms of office for student Senators to begin on 1 May of each year rather than the current 1 April of each year.”

The Committee notes that past senates and registrars have already received two internal legal opinions on the difficulty in changing these dates of office given the stipulations made in the *University Act*. Given the importance of this matter to student senators, and with all respect to the University’s learned legal staff, the Committee would suggest that the Registrar seek a third opinion.

This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Nominating Committee.