



VANCOUVER SENATE

MINUTES OF 22 JULY 2020

DRAFT

Attendance

Present: S. Ono (Chair), K. Ross (Secretary), S. Point, A. Szeri, S. Parker, J. Olson, G. Averill, R. Helsley, B. Frank, J. Innes, S. Porter, R. Yada, C Dauvergne, M. Coughtrie, M. Aronson, V. Bungay, C. Marshall, M. Kuus, A. Fisher, G. Faulkner, K. Lo, R. Boushel, P. Marshall, IT. Rogers, S. Grayston, S. Matsui, C. Krebs, M. Koehoord, A. Collier, P Loewen, M. Thachuk S Forwell, P. Harrison, C. Jaeger, P. Keown, A. Kindler, W. McKee, A. Ivanov , S. Singh L. Stothers, S. Thorne, T. Ahmed, L. Burr, A. Dulay, B. Fisher, J. Gilbert, S. Haffey, W. McNulty, S. Ngo, J. Shepherd, M. Stewart, R. Tees, G. Tsiakos, M Higgans, R. Topping, C. Godwin, J. Greenman, A. Gonzalez, J. Zheng, C. Koenig, D. Agosti-Moro, C. Moonias, A. Mehrizi, N. Pang, N. Rygnestad-Stahl, T. Yan, D. Liu, J. Burnham, C. Hakim, M. Holmes, D Nguyen

Regrets: S. Bates, M. MacDougall, D. Kelleher, M Isaacson. D. MacDonald, H von Bergmann, V. Griess, I. Frigaard, A. Sheppard, P. Choi, P Keown, A. Murphy, C. Nislow, H. Leong, J Shepherd, C. Koenig, N. Pang, C. Evans, T. Benbow, E. Bhangu,

Call to Order

The Chair of Senate, Dr Santa J. Ono, called the second special meeting of the Senate for the 2019/2020 academic year to order at 6:08 pm.

NEW MEMBERS:

The Registrar, Dr Kathleen Ross, welcomed the following new members to Senate:

The Honourable Steven Lewis Point, OBC, Chancellor of the University
Dr Michael W. Higgins, Representative of St. Mark's College

Remarks from the Chair

The President and Chair of Senate, Dr Santa Ono, acknowledge the addition of the newest member of Senate, Chancellor Steven Lewis Point.

Dr Ono updated the Senate on the administrations for resumption of programs and activities on UBC's campuses: UBC will primarily offer larger classes online with selected smaller classes conducted in-person, adhering to physical distancing and other public health requirements. Dr



Ono noted that this will be a very different September than we are used to. Traditional events such as Imagine, Create, Homecoming and welcome back events for faculty, staff and students will either be offered in different formats or not offered at all.

The President said that he appreciated that COVID-19 has meant significant adjustment for everyone. Please know that your efforts do not go unnoticed. As we prepare for September, we have begun to implement a robust process for the resumption of academic, administrative and ancillary services, based on guiding principles focused on the health, safety and wellbeing of students, faculty, staff and the public.

Dr Ono noted that it was expected that many faculty and staff will continue to work from home. Faculty and staff who do need to come to campus for their work must complete mandatory COVID-19 training. He added that UBC was also preparing a student training module as it was vital that we maintain health and safety standards for those returning to our campuses. This includes staying home if people are ill, getting tested if they have symptoms, and continuing to practice good hygiene by frequent hand washing and maintaining physical distancing as much as possible.

The President concluded his remarks by speaking about systemic racism at UBC. Over the past several weeks he has been listening to members of the Black Caucus. With time he will expand those listening sessions to include Indigenous and Asian groups as well as other marginalized communities. Following these consultations, he said he planned to establish an advisory committee on systemic racism. Dr Ono said that diversity is our strength. We can play a role against hatred, oppression, violence and injustice and find a way to support and elevate those who have been traditionally, systemically, and historically marginalized. Dr Ono noted that later in this meeting, Julie Burnham will present the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Diversity and Inclusion. I'm looking forward to hearing what the committee has to report and how that important work intersects with our current challenges.

Senator Mehrizi asked how the university would navigate research student progress given research curtailment. She noted that at a previous meeting we discussed this issue and she asked what plans can be put in place to support graduate student research.

The president noted that the Federal government has decided to make funds available but it hasn't been made clear how that will be made available to institutions and then students to date. In noted that in reviewing reopening plans of the faculties this was being kept in mind.

Dean Porter said that there was significant disruption and we are working on a proposal. There was an initial emergency fund that was not being used effectively; a streamlined emergency bursary was developed and over \$3m in funds have been disbursed. Through the VPR office other funds have been made available for those with terminated research funds. We've also moved ahead our partial tuition awards for PhD students. We are continuing to look at every possible option to support students in a challenging place.



Senator Singh noted that September was an important date for many students being first welcomed to UBC. He asked what our plan would be for a virtual welcoming to the University and to assure them that we are here for them virtually.

The president said that various groups in the faculties, VPS, and alumni are thinking about to provide a welcome to the many who will not be here. These plans are still under development.

Senator Mehrizi said that the university has put a lot of effort into place to support students in the short term, but longer-term effects are causing some students to not think they will finish their degrees. She also asked if a guideline was being prepared for online or virtual supervision such as the University of Toronto has developed.

Dean Porter said that UBC has already created some guidelines and she would send them to the Senator.

Academic Policy Committee

The Chair of the Senate Academic Policy Committee, Dr Paul Harrison, presented

New School of Creative Writing

Paul Harrison	}	<i>That Senate approve the establishment of the UBC School of Creative Writing, as set out in the attached.</i>
Claudia Krebs		

Senator Harrison set out the criteria for schools of the university, and it is rare that those criteria are fully met. He noted that creative writing was a leader in its field across Canada. It is populated by award winning writers. Within the faculty of arts, the structure of a school will support the discipline to grow even greater.

With permission of Senate, Professor Alix Ohlin spoke to the proposal. She noted that since 1954, creative writing was taught at UBC through a variety of departments. She noted the national and international success of the program. Over the past decades the program has grown and evolved academically. She said that the wide-ranging constellations of genres in the program was unique in north America.

Approved

Curriculum Committee



The Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee, Dr Peter Marshall, presented.

TRANSCRIPT NOTATION DUE TO COVID-19

Peter Marshall	}	<i>That the Okanagan and Vancouver Senates approve the following transcript notation for inclusion on the transcripts of all students who were registered in the 2019 Winter Session: “As of 16 March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted regular academic activities. Modes of instruction and assessment were shifted to on-line activities mid-term, including changes to exam practices and weighting in some cases. Deadlines to withdraw or change to Credit/D/Fail or Pass/Fail grading were extended by some programs.”</i>
Philip Loewen		

Dr P. Marshall said that this matter was referred back to his committee at a previous meeting of Senate as the student members felt the statement originally proposed did not reflect the hardships faced by this pandemic and should contain more information. The Committee took into considering the concerns and suggestions made by student members of Senate, as well as the seven other notations UBC knew about being used or proposed at other institutions. The end result was a compromise but one acceptable to the Okanagan and Vancouver curriculum committees and the student members.

Approved

COURSE CODES IN WORKDAY

Peter Marshall	}	<i>That Senate approve in principle the differentiation of course codes by a campus identifier following the subject code, and that such approach be applied to all course codes on both campuses at UBC.</i>
Lynn Stothers		

Dr P. Marshall spoke to the proposal. He noted that the Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees met jointly with members of the Integrated Renewal Program (IRP) to consider the future state of subject and course codes in UBC's new student information system, Workday. The Committees were provided with an overview of the issues to be resolved, decisions to be made, analysis conducted by the IRP team, and options to be considered. The discussion spanned two meetings. As noted in his report, UBC has historically allowed each campus Senate to approve courses with the same subject code and course number (i.e. course



code) whether or not they are aligned in subject, content, or course requirements. While new shared course codes are no longer approved, many such courses still exist and are offered on both campuses. Some courses that share a course code are identical, some are similar, and some are completely different. Workday is being established as one student information system for all of UBC. Within the system, each course must have a unique course code. Therefore, the Committees were tasked with resolving the issue of the courses on each campus that share a course code. The Committees were asked to jointly consider two decisions: 1. an approach for differentiating shared course codes; 2. the scope of codes that the approach should be applied to.

Dr P. Marshall noted that the following principles guided the Committees' decision-making:

- Prioritize student experience and their ability to achieve desired outcomes
- Seek logical consistency in approach
- Seek a solution that can adapt to change and accommodate growth ("futureproofing")
- Support individual units to achieve local objectives related to course codes
- Take an equitable approach across the two campuses
- Consider the effort required to enact a solution in relation to its long-term value.

Dr P. Marshall advised that taking into consideration the full scope of analysis, technical limitations and guided by the decision principles that appear above, the Committees ultimately made the following decisions:

1. Course codes are to be differentiated by an underscore followed by the campus identifier (i.e., ENGL_O and ENGL_V)
2. The approach is to be applied to all subject codes on both campuses

Senator Thachuk said that he was not in favour of how this would appear on a transcript. He suggested that using V and O would be confusing when we could use the number system instead to differentiate.

With permission of Senate, Dr Jenny Phelps from the IRP spoke to the situation. She noted that we are not yet certain if the underscore character needs to actually appear on transcripts. It may be optional. She went on at length about how numerical approach was unfortunately not workable.

Dr C. Marshall said we should postpone until we knew how transcripts would appear.

Dr Ross said that it was beyond the software, we have a problem today about courses on each campus and this has negatively affected students. She said that she suspected that we could drop the underscore from a transcript but could not commit to that. She advised that we needed this decision now to move forward with Workday student.

Approved



Nominating Committee

The Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee, Dr Richard Tees, presented.

TRIENNIAL REVIEW

See Appendix A: Triennial review report

Dr Tees noted that the rationale for each recommendation were as set out in the report. In those cases where the Nominating Committee was not unanimous in its recommendation, that was noted in the report.

Richard Tees	}	<i>That Senate approve the recommendation in Part 1 (External Review) of the report;</i>
Sally Thorne		

Senator Ahmed asked if this was a unanimous recommendation.

Senator Tees said this was unanimous.

Richard Tees	}	<i>That Senate approves the recommendations in Part 2 (Committee Terms of Reference Amendments) of the report.</i>	Approved
Dante Agosti-Moro			

Richard Tees	}	<i>That Senate approves the recommendations in Part 3 (Committee Composition Amendments) of the report.</i>	Approved
Paul Harrison			

Richard Tees	}	<i>That Senate approves the recommendations in Part 4 (Amendments to the Rules and Procedures of Senate) of this report</i>	Approved
Paul Harrison			

MOTION TO DIVIDE



Richard Tees
Sean Haffey

}

*That the motion be divided to consider each
recommendation seriatim.*

Approved

RECOMMENDATION 1: TRAINING FOR APPEALS COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Richard Tees
Paul Harrison

}

*That Senate approves recommendation 1:
Training for Appeals committee Members.*

Senator Ahmed said he had a number of practical and procedural concerns with this proposal. He agreed that there was room for improvement in the training offered to appeals committee members; that said, he did not know that a mandated training programs should be required as he trusted his colleagues to attend what training they needed. More significantly, he said that precluding attendance at hearings before specific training could stifle attendance or delay hearings and thus harm timely decisions. He did not think the fairness of hearings was harmed by ad hoc processes. Procedurally, he said that he was concerned that this recommendation was being brought forward without his committees input and support. With respect to jurisdiction, he said that this decision should be made by the appeals committees and not by the Senate. Mr Ahmed said that a more respectful recommendation would be for the appeals committees to review the matter and report back to the Senate on their plans. He noted that process matters, and encouraged senators to reject this recommendation until he could be better considered by those affected. Senate should respect its committees and the Nominating Committee should behave differently

Senator Agosti-Moro said that he agreed with Senator Ahmed in that the Nominating Committee should consult with affected committees, that said, he supported the recommendation for two reasons. Firstly, as a new committee member he was only given procedural training and had to seek out his own training on trauma-informed practice and its impacts on procedural fairness matters. We need to ensure that there is more equal knowledge and experience between committee members. These decisions can affect the entire lives of person and so it is important that people be as well training as possible.

Senator Holmes agreed with Senator Agosti-Moro and noted that the student members of Senate have raised this as an issue for years and the appeals committees have not acted upon them. The students sent a submission on this matter over a year ago and raised it on the floor of Senate. He said that it was not appropriate to allow committee members to decide if they wanted trauma-informed or anti-bias training. He said that not receiving sufficient training and support is why students were hesitant to participate in appeals committees; right now, the only people who want to join the appeals committees are those who already felt prepared to do so. This will lead to better processes for all involved in appeals processes, especially students.



Senator Gonzalez echoed the comments of Senators Agosti-Moro and Holmes; he noted that as an engineer he had no experience in legal matters and without procedural fairness training he would have felt disadvantaged and unprepared. Reminders of things like bias would be helpful.

Senator Thorne said that this recommendation wasn't unanimous at the Nominating Committee because of the potential for this matter to be referred to the external reviews planned but also the complexity of appeals matters and the various options for procedural models. We haven't had a chance to consider that in depth.

Senator Collier asked who would pay for mandatory training. She noted that if it was expensive the University may not have training as frequently as needed due to costs.

Mr Eaton, the Clerk to the Senate said that in the past we have used the Justice Institute of BC, external counsel, and training offered by the Office of the University Counsel when appropriate. He agreed that if approved this resolution will increase costs.

Senator C. Marshall said that he appreciated the concerns raised by the students but suggested that was why they should be voting against this recommendation as it did not recommend the specific areas of training that the students were seeking. He suggested that every member of Senate, not just the appeals committees, should have such training.

Senator Burnham said that the only thing being mandated was that training occur; there was still a lot of flexibility on what that training entailed. Those conversations should happen within the appeals committees. The students on these committees change every year and there is no guarantee that people have similar familiarity with issues. Right now, there is no training regarding trauma-informed approaches and she was not comfortable with that being at the election of committee members.

Senator Tees agreed with Senator Thorne on the external review mechanism being the best way to consider this matter. He noted that this recommendation came to the Nominating Committee very late from the students and in its hurry the Nominating Committee did not realize that the matter had not been consulted on more broadly. He apologized for that error and offered to resign.

Senator Rygnestad-Stahl said that she understood the concerns around consultation and there should have been more, but that didn't negate the substantive importance of the recommendation. The Committee Chairs have been very helpful in providing orientations and training to members but that is dependent on the skills of those involved and if there are gaps, students have to seek out help. This recommendation is worded in a way that won't make it more difficult to reach quorum as it gives a lot of latitude to the committees to decide on processes that meet their needs. To save costs she recommended that we use internal resources as much as we can. While she personally felt she had the necessary training she knew that wasn't true for all students.



The Chair noted that a large number of people wished to speak and he asked Senators not to be repetitive and focus on things that are different from other speakers in the interests of time.

Senator Hakim said that the external review's point was to bring in outside viewpoints and expertise on matters, but when it comes to mandatory training and various baselines of knowledge on topics such as sexual violence, we have already heard a lot of viewpoints. He said that we didn't need an external review to do this and we will likely get the same recommendation months from now.

Senator Stewart said that training was important to appeals committee members, especially students, and even as a lawyer he had asked for additional training. He was concerned that the recommendation was drafted as a prohibition on service until training was completed though. He said that this would prohibit those members of the committee who did feel that they already had sufficient training from other sources, such as being lawyers, from participating.

Senator Lo asked if we viewed appeals committee members as judges or as a jury. If the latter, we only need to concern ourselves with the training of our chairs.

Senator Agosti-Moro said that no one was being barred from service, what they are being barred from was acting as a judge. He said that one of the world's best universities should not have committee members without sufficient knowledge to make an informed and fair decision. He noted that the current Chair of the Appeals Committee was fantastic but we had no assurances that his successor would be.

Senator Hakim said that this wasn't just about building up capacity but also prevention of harm. We also need to prepare both committee members and appellants better so that they are not traumatized. He noted that these were nuanced issues that are being considered by the justice system in Canada as well in terms of racialized violence, trauma informed approaches, and bias. We need to equip our appeals committees to deal with such issues properly.

Senator Burr appealed to the students to not filibuster and not keep saying the same things. He appreciated that what they were saying was important and worthy of a huge amount of discussion, but said that these matters should have been brought up earlier and we were spending many minutes this evening going over the same things. He suggested having one student speak to each matter.

Senator Kindler said that as a member of the Nominating Committee she was in favour of the motion. She interpreted the student call for this change as a feeling that the current rules allow for the perception that insufficient training was provided. Given the seriousness of the matter, we need to ensure that appeals are heard with all of the relevant knowledge considered. She noted that senate was a service to the community. If students had concerns around training, we should give those concerns the benefit of the doubt. She acknowledged that this may result in people having redundant training but that shouldn't be an offense, rather, this was an aspect of service



and ensuring no negative impacts. Dr Kindler said that we could look at modularized training to allow for different timing and opportunities.

MOTION TO REFER

Claudia Krebs	}	<i>That the recommendation be referred back to the Nominating Committee for consultation with the appeals committees, and that a new recommendation be brought forward to the October meeting of senate.</i>
Susan Forwell		

Senator Holmes spoke against the referral. He did not agree that this matter was rushed. He noted that the students had discussed the matter with appeals committees and the Secretary to Senate. He said that for years the students have had these concerns and they were told to bring these matters up through the triennial review. He said that he did not appreciate students being labelled and not being heard. The students were trying to ensure that when survivors of sexual violence are involved in these processes that basic training is provided to committee members. He viewed delay on this matter as frustrating and insulting. The students have not spoken more on this matter than the faculty and convocation. These recommendation gives great power to the committees to shape this matter. He noted how amazing the chair of the appeals committee was currently, but noted that there could be a situation without a supportive chair.

Senator Krebs said that she agreed with the students and their passion on this matter. She said that mandatory training in such matters was clearly necessary, but that she agreed with the concerns raised by the appeals committees and felt that consultation with them was an important final step.

Senator Thackuk said no one objected to the value of training but this motion didn't obligate training, it just prohibited participation without training. This could prevent matters from being heard as it didn't mandate training in a timely manner and this could exclude members.

Motion to
Approved

RECOMMENDATION 2: COMMITTEE CHAIR TERM LIMITS

Richard Tees	}	<i>That Senate approves recommendation 2: Committee Chair Term Limits</i>
Paul Harrison		

Senator Haffey spoke in principle against term limits, saying that they would only work if senators were elected on an annual basis. He said that chairs should be allowed to serve for more than six years if their committees so desire.



Senator Innes said that the recommendation did not go far enough. He agreed that committee chairs should have term limits but he felt that committees and the Senate itself should have term limits.

Senator Burnham said she agreed with Dean Innes but said that this was a small step towards better processes. She said that this would help with equity, diversity, and inclusion concerns.

Senator Holmes spoke in favour of the motion but agreed with Dean Innes in needing to look further. He noted that we already had a model that worked from UBC Okanagan and this changeover in leadership would hopefully encourage faculty to get more involved.

RECOMMENDATION 3: COMMITTEE CHAIR ELECTIONS.

Richard Tees	}	<i>That Senate approves recommendation 3: Committee Chair Elections.</i>
Paul Harrison		

Approved

MOTION TO EXTEND

Richard Tees	}	<i>That the time to adjourn be extended by 1 hour.</i>
Claudia Krebs		

Approved

RECOMMENDATION 4: SENATE COMMITTEE AGENDAS

Richard Tees	}	<i>That Senate approves recommendation 4: Senate Committee Agendas.</i>
Paul Harrison		

Senator Thackuk asked if this would prevent the committees from setting agendas due to availability.

Senator Tees said it may be aspirational but didn't think that it would impede work.

Senator Holmes said that this would lead to greater inclusion and input, especially of students. This would allow for responsibilities to be more shared.

Approved

RECOMMENDATION 5: SENATORS AS OBSERVERS AT COMMITTEES



Richard Tees
Paul Harrison

}

*That Senate approves recommendation 5:
Senators as Observers at Committees*

Senator Gonzalez confirmed for Senator Forwell that this proposal would not apply to the senate appeals committees or other sessions that needed to be in camera.

Senator Holmes noted that the Nominating Committee's report says that in part this was to help with issues around student schedules not allow their full participation. He said that he still hoped that committees would be more open to adjusting their schedules on a term or annual basis to make Senate more inclusive of student members.

Approved

Richard Tees
Alex Gonzalez

}

That Senate approves the recommendations in Part 5 (Recommendations to Committees and Officers of the University), with the addition of the membership of the director of the First Nations House of Learning on the Senate Curriculum Committee and the Senate Teaching & Learning Committee as an ex officio voting member.

Approved

Ad Hoc Committee Report

Julia Burnham
Alex Gonzalez

}

That Senate receive the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Diversity and Inclusion; approve the recommendations therein; and discharge the committee.

Senator Burnham noted that the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Diversity and Inclusion (SACADI) was created in 2018 to understand and report on the diversity and inclusion landscape within the academic realm at UBC. This aligned not only with expanding considerations of issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) across the institution, but also initiatives such as Shaping UBC's Next Century, the Indigenous Strategic Plan, and perhaps most notably for the Committee's purposes, the Inclusion Action Plan (IAP). SACADI used the IAP as a framework to seek feedback from Senate standing committees for incorporating academic diversity and inclusion into the committees' work. This engagement process highlighted committees' varying capacities to engage with EDI principles and to make EDI-informed decisions. Guided by its



terms of reference, and drawing upon learnings from a series of presentations by stakeholders across campus, a review of data from multiple surveys, and engagement with the Senate standing committees, SACADI has both identified areas for further examination and made recommendations for Senate's consideration, as detailed in its final report. The Committees recommendations were as follows:

- That the Senate endorse the frameworks within the Inclusion Action Plan as they apply to the operations of the Senate
- That the Nominating Committee recommend to Senate the creation of a structure or committee to address academic diversity and inclusion, and continue the work of SACADI.
- That the Senate work with the Board of Governors to consider establishing a statement on UBC's values of equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Senator Harrison said that he wasn't sure what endorsing the IAP framework would mean. He said that he was concerned that the IAP did not reflect the role of the senate in university governance.

Senator Burnham said that the IAP is not the SACADI report, and the consultation undertaken was not on behalf of the IAP. Our consultation used the IAP as a framework for reflection and what the limitations would be under those broad goals.

Approved

Reports from the Registrar

CASTING OF DECIDING VOTE IN TIED ELECTION FOR STUDENT MEMBER OF SENATE FROM THE FACULTY OF LAND AND FOOD SYSTEMS

The Registrar advised the election of a student member of Senate from the Faculty of Land and Food Systems, held 28 April-12 May 2020 has resulted in a tie. Pursuant to Section 16 (3) of the University Act, "If there is a tie vote between 2 or more candidates for an office at the University of British Columbia," and "...if the office is as a member of a senate, the senate must cast the deciding vote." She noted that the two tied candidates are Kelvin Au and Anisha Sandhu.

The Senate casted a deciding vote for Anisha Sandhu.

2020-2023 TRIENNIAL ELECTION RESULTS

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FACULTIES TO SENATE



The Registrar noted that further to the third call for nominations for faculty members of the Vancouver campus to fill the two (2) positions for representatives of each Faculty* on the Vancouver Senate issued on 21 May 2020, seven (7) valid nominations have been received. Therefore, pursuant to Section 15 of the University Act, the following faculty members are acclaimed as elected as representatives of the Faculties on the Vancouver Senate for terms beginning on 1 September 2020 and ending 31 August 2023 and thereafter until successors are elected:

- Dr HsingChi von Bergmann, Professor, Faculty of Dentistry
- Dr Sue Grayston, Professor, Faculty of Land and Food Systems
- Dr Anubhav Singh, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Land and Food Systems
- Dr Shigenori Matsui, Professor, Peter A. Allard School of Law
- Mr James Stewart, Associate Professor, Peter A. Allard School of Law
- Dr Ingrid Price, Associate Professor of Teaching, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences

Additionally, further to the election for representatives from the Faculty of Forestry that closed on 4 June 2020, the following faculty members are elected as representatives of the Faculty on the Vancouver Senate for terms beginning on 1 September 2020 and ending 31 August 2023 and thereafter until successors are elected:

Dr Janette Bulkan, Associate Professor, Faculty of Forestry
Dr Hisham Zerriffi, Associate Professor, Faculty of Forestry

Dr Ross noted that Three (3) positions remained open after three rounds of nominations. She advised that another call will be made in September 2020. She also noted that an election for Convocation representatives to the Vancouver Senate closed on 15 July 2020 but that results were not yet available.

CONFIRMATION OF EMAIL APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION REGARDING INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE, ADVANCED PLACEMENT, AND GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION – ADVANCED LEVEL COURSES

The Registrar confirmed that that as no objections were received by the deadline of 26 June 2020 to the following resolution distributed to the Senate via email and posted to senate.ubc.ca, was approved as of that date: “That UBC continue to offer advanced placement and credit for International Baccalaureate – Higher Level, Advanced Placement, and General Certificate of Education – Advanced Level students under the modified assessment modes used for those courses and examinations completed in the spring of 2020.”

Adjournment

Seeing no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:13 pm.



Appendix A: Triennial Review Report

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 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 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 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 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.