SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Office of the Vice President, Academic

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate

FROM: J.M. Munro, Chair,
Senate Review Committee

SUBJECT: Final Report

DATE: January 14, 2000

The final report of the Senate Review Committee is attached. There are significant revisions to section VII. that reflect the discussion at the November 1, 1999 Senate meeting and SRC's further deliberations.

SRC recommends that this report be discussed by Senate in committee of the whole and that then the following motions be considered by Senate.

1. To adopt section VI of the SRC Report as a statement of purpose for Senate to become Section II of the Rules of Senate.

2. To direct the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules to prepare an agenda-setting motion that incorporates recommendations A.1, A.2. and A.5 in Section V of the Rules of Senate .

3. To agree to the restructuring of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies as proposed in section B.1.i. of the SRC Report.

4. To agree to the restructuring of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning into the Senate Committee on University Priorities as proposed in section B.1.ii. of the SRC Report.

5. To agree that the Senate Committee on University Budget be abolished and that its functions be performed by the Senate Committee on University Priorities as proposed in section B.1.iii. of the SRC Report.

6. To agree to the restructuring of Library Penalties Appeal Committee as proposed in section B.1.iv. of the SRC Report.

7. To agree to the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees be abolished and replaced by the Senate Committee on University Honours as proposed in section B.1.v. of the SRC Report.

8. To agree to the restructuring of the Senate Committee on Enrollment Management Planning as proposed in section B.1.vi. of the SRC Report.

9. To charge all restructured committees to submit revised terms of reference by *for approval by Senate)* June, 2000 as proposed in section B.2. of the SRC Report.

10. To add the committee recommendations concerning vice chairs, quorums, nomination and open meetings to section VI of the Rules of Senate. as proposed in sections B.3, 4., 5., and C.4. of the SRC Report.

11. To change the method of ~~election~~ *selection* for all Senate committees so that all *candidates, except ex-officio members,* ~~elected members~~ are nominated by the Senate Nominations Committee as proposed in section B.5. of the SRC Report.

12. To authorize a change in Senate's meeting time for a one year period beginning June 1, 2000 as proposed in section C.3. of the SRC Report.

SRC believes that it has completed the task assigned to it in its terms of reference and considers itself disbanded. SRC members will, however, be pleased to advise on any implementation issues.

Senate Review Committee
REPORT

January 14, 2000

I. Introduction

Senate established the Senate Review Committee (SRC) at its meeting of February 1, 1999. The Committee's terms of reference are in Appendix A. In brief, SRC was asked to review the structure of Senate and to ensure that the structure was "efficient, effective and complies with the University Act". SRC interpreted this to require a full review of the organization and effectiveness of Senate including the structure and operation of the 24 Senate committees (a listing of current Senate committees is presented in Appendix B), the conduct of Senate meetings, and the success of the current structure in meeting the statutory and community expectations for Senate's role in the governance of the University.

SRC was appointed by the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules on March 30, 1999 and held its first meeting on April 8, 1999. Appendix A lists the members of the Committee. The Committee undertook three related surveys of university opinion concerning the effectiveness of Senate. Three questionnaires were written and distributed – one to Senate committee chairs asking them to respond to questions related to the functioning of the different Senate committees, one to current and former Senators, and one to the university community at large. The Committee also met with a number of administrators in their roles as chairs of Senate committees. Additional information concerning the operation of Senate was obtained from Secretariat Services and some material was gathered from other universities. The Committee also received three case studies of Senate decision-making.

Three fundamental issues seemed to SRC to be reflected in one way or another in much of the material that we considered. The first is that as the University has grown (student numbers have doubled in 20 years) some decision-making authority, for example over budgets, has necessarily shifted to Faculties. Administrative and governance structures that were suitable for a smaller, more centralized university are

less appropriate for a larger, more diverse and decentralized institution. Senate's role therefore needs re-thinking; it should be the place where larger, University-wide issues are given thorough debate. A second issue is that there is a fundamental disagreement about the roles which members of Senate are supposed to play with reference to the groups that they represent. In SRC's view, Senators should think of themselves as accountable in the trustee sense, not in the delegate sense. Senators should bring a sense of the values and priorities of the whole university community to their work on Senate. Finally, we should all be concerned that many students and faculty with an interest in the academic governance of our institution believe that Senate is a marginal institution apparently controlled by administrators and their personal agendas. SRC does not agree, but this perception is real and worrying.

Our recommendations for a revitalized Senate would, we believe, have a profound effect on the way Senate is perceived and, more importantly, on what it actually does in the University. SRC wishes to emphasize that we do not wish Senate to become a body that tries to operate the University. Our recommendations are intended to implement the statement of purpose for Senate that we have proposed in this report.

II. Summaries of Responses

The response rate from the university community questionnaires was low (64 returns). The response to the questionnaires distributed to current and former Senators was also small (19 returns). Within these groups there was considerable diversity of opinion concerning the functioning of Senate and desirable improvements. The SRC's overall conclusions from the surveys were that Senate is perceived as functioning at a generally satisfactory level but that respondents believed there was scope for improvement. SRC believes that the relatively low level of response could signify lack of knowledge about Senate or lack of interest in Senate or it could reflect a view that nothing would result from the work of SRC

Perhaps the most significant finding from both surveys was that most felt that Senate had not been a place where important university issues had been discussed and that much of Senate's business consisted of routine bureaucratic exercises.

Community Survey

Six questions were asked on the community survey; the following summary is based on the 64 responses to the 2500 questionnaires that were distributed.

I. What do you know about the functioning of the SFU Senate?
The most common answer was "nothing", or something close to it. However, some respondents said they had some familiarity with Senate.

Ii. How satisfied are you with the work of the SFU Senate?
Some were not satisfied with the work of Senate; the most common reasons were that it rubber-stamped decisions made elsewhere, that its meetings were too procedural, and that administrators dominated Senate. Many had no opinion on this question.

Iii. What suggestions do you have for improving Senate?
Most responses suggested better informing the university community about Senate's responsibilities and activities.

Iv. How satisfied are you with the work of Senate's committees?
Most respondents had no answer to this question and among those who did respond there was a wide range of committee-specific responses. Most committees were judged to be "good" but there was not a discernible overall pattern.
v. What suggestions do you have for improving Senate's committees?
Answers focussed on the need for better information about Senate committees and what they do, and how to communicate this to the community. Dissatisfaction was expressed by some over the number of administrators on Senate committees.
Several respondents used this question to give opinions about how to improve the university. There were suggestions for new Senate committees on research and on the natural environment.

vi. Have you ever considered running for Senate?

Most respondents had not considered standing for election to; some added that they were too busy and some said that they felt Senate served no purpose in its present form. Some said this was because meeting times were inconvenient. A few noted that there are no positions for staff on Senate.

Current and Former Senator Survey

Five questions were asked in the survey of current and former Senators. This summary is based on 19 responses of 150 questionnaires distributed.

l. How satisfied are you with the work of the SFU Senate?

Senate was given assessments of "good", "moderate", and "poor" from 6, 8, and 3 respondents, respectively. Criticisms reflected the beliefs that Senate was dominated by administrators and that it failed to address major university issues.

li. What suggestions do you have for improving the Senate process?

The following suggestions were included:

• students should represent all SFU students, not the Simon Fraser Student Society

• Senate should be less reactionary

• Senate should discuss more substantive matters and be more independent

• Administrators should not dominate Senate

• the attendance record of Senators should be improved

• ex officio members should not have acting administrators as substitutes or else all Senators should have alternates

• committee/Senate interaction should be improved

lii. What committees of Senate have you served on?

One respondent had not been on any Senate committees; the others had all been on several committees (the maximum reported was 11).

Iv. What is your experience of the effectiveness of operation of each committee?
Respondents provided opinions on 19 Senate committees. Positive opinions of committee effectiveness were expressed with the exception of SCUB. Opinions of SGSC, SLC, and SCCS were mixed. It was apparent from the responses that some opinions were based on limited knowledge of the current situation of committees.

v. What suggestions do you have for improving Senate's committee structure or processes?
Frequently mentioned suggestions were:

• avoid evening meetings
• set time limits for committee and senate memberships
• reduce paperwork
• streamline committee/Senate interactions
• avoid dominance of parochial interests
• improve orientation for new senators and committee members
• ensure that important policy matters are brought to Senate with ample time for discussion
• review and revise committee terms of reference
• only Senate should fill committee positions
• reduce domination by administrators

Committee Chair Survey

Responses were received from the chairs of 16 of the 24 Senate committees and the meetings with committee chairs yielded observations on several others. Fifteen questions were included in the questionnaire. Committee chairs were informed they could either consult with committee members or respond on behalf of the committee. While all responses were used by SRC in formulating its recommendations for the reform of Senate's committee structure, only seven questions are summarized here.

I. Do the terms of reference adequately describe what the committee does?

All but three committee chairs answered "yes" to this question. The exceptions were SCAP, SCUB, and SCUS.

Ii. How long does it take the committee to deal with an issue?

Almost every committee chair's response implied that all matters were dealt with at one meeting. The time for an issue to be dealt with was therefore a function of the time between committee meetings. This appeared to be as frequently as once a month and, for one or two committees, twice a year.

Iii. Are there issues that should come to the committee but do not?

Ten committee chairs answered "no", three did not know, and three (SCAP, SCUB, SCIA) answered "yes".

Iv. Is the committee's membership appropriate in terms of size and composition?

All but one committee chair (SCAP) felt that the composition and size of the committee was appropriate.

v. Is there an orientation for new members?

Among the 16 respondents, only four Senate committees (ISEC, SPCSAB, SNC, SCIA) have orientations for new members.

vi. Are you satisfied with the method of election and appointment of committee members?

All but three committee chairs (SCAP, SCUB, DQAC) answered "yes" to this question.

vii. Could the work of the committee be done elsewhere?

All but two committee chairs answered "no" (ACNGP, LPAC answered "maybe").

The members of SRC also met with the chairs of several committees in order to discuss their survey responses and ask questions about the functioning of the committees. The overall tenor of responses suggests satisfaction with the status quo.

Student Society Response

The Simon Fraser Student Society also made a submission to SRC that included the following criticism and suggestions.

1. Senate is inefficient and unaccountable.

2. Senators should be held accountable to their constituent groups. In the case of student Senators, a student caucus should be formed.

3. Senate procedures provide few opportunities for other members of the University community to participate in discussion of matters under consideration.

4. Senate's committee structure is too complex and there are few requirements for consultation with the University community.

5. Senate imposes terms of reference or composition on committees without their consent.

6. At-large student members of Senate committees should be elected through the Student Society Forum.

7. A few Senators dominate Senate debates and there is lax enforcement of procedural rules.

Other Responses

Following the discussion of its draft report by Senate, SRC received comments from several alumni and student Senators proposing that student members of Senate committees not be appointed by the Simon Fraser Student Society.

An extensive submission from Archives and Records proposed new procedures for the retention of Senate and Senate committee records.

Case Studies

In order to better understand how Senate has functioned, SRC undertook studies of three cases which illustrate Senate's involvement in important University decisions. These were:

1. Endowed Chairs Policy;

2. TIME Centre (Technology, Innovation, Management, Entrepreneurship);

3. Enrollment Management

In SRC's view Senate was involved years too late in the Endowed Chairs Policy and in the TIME Centre the appropriate Senate committee (Downtown Campus Planning Committee, a sub-committee of SCAP) was not involved. Decisions concerning enrollment management seemed to us to have had appropriate and timely Senate involvement.

III. Comparisons with Other Universities

Appendix C presents a comparison of the membership and committee structures of other Canadian university senates. Simon Fraser's Senate has fewer members and more committees than others. Comparisons with the other two universities governed by the University Act (University of B.C.- 87 members and 16 committees - and University of Victoria - 74 members and 13 committees) are particularly relevant. (It should be noted that in B.C. the total number of Senate members is determined by the number of ex officio members.)

IV. Senate in the University Act

The University Act is not a simple, straightforward statute. Much of its language and organization are convoluted (for example the limitation of enrollment is in the Board section and requires Senate approval but there is no mention of this power in the Senate section) and substantial parts of it deal with functions and processes in

universities that are either archaic or infrequent. Section 47 sets out the functions and duties of a university and requires that it do all of the following "so far and to the full extent that its resources from time to time permit":

- establish and maintain faculties and departments;
- provide instruction in all branches of knowledge;
- establish research facilities in all branches of knowledge;
- establish scholarships and other financial aids to encourage proficiency in learning and research;
- provide continuing education in all fields throughout British Columbia;
- promote the work of the university through the cooperative effort of the Board, Senate and other constituent parts of the university.

Section 35 specifies the membership of Senate and, with section 14, the process by which members are elected or appointed. Section 36 deals with terms of office and the method of filling vacancies. There is no limit on the number of terms a member may serve. The responsibilities of Senate are enumerated in section 37. The text of these three sections is in Appendix D.

Section 37 begins with a general statement of Senate's mandate. Subsection (1) states that "the academic governance of the university is vested in the senate". The following sub-subsections (a) through (x) permit Senate to take various actions to fulfill that mandate. The exact phrasing is "it has the following powers", implying that Senate is not necessarily required to carry out any of these actions.

SRC has identified the following section 37 powers which our Senate has chosen not to exercise.

(d)   Examinations. Senate does not take a role in setting examinations in the form envisaged.

(j)   Scholarships and Awards. Senate has delegated this power to SPCSAB and no recommendation is made to the Board of Governors.

(k)   Senate does not "determine the members of teaching and administrative staffs who are to be members of each faculty."

(m)   Senate has established no policies regarding "heritage objects".

(o)   Only very rarely does Senate "make recommendations to the board considered advisable for promoting the interests of the university or for carrying out the objects and provisions of this Act".

(p)   The meaning of this section, which empowers Senate to deal with matters reported by Faculties, is unclear.

(q)   Senate has no standing committee to deal with matters referred to it by the Board. Such referrals are rare (recent examples have only involved search procedures) and have been dealt with by SCAR.

(w)   There is no standing committee to deal with relations with other B.C. post-secondary institutions.

(x)   Advisory committees exist in some faculties, but not because Senate has required their establishment.

As well, there are several other sections of the University Act which impinge directly on Senate's responsibilities.

Section 9 states that Senate makes rules for Convocation and gives it the power to augment the membership of Convocation. Senate has not established rules for Convocation except with respect to its "meetings" for the purposes of electing the Chancellor.

Section 27 specifies the powers of the Board of Governors. Subsection (2) includes several powers which are to exercised in conjunction with Senate; the following sub-sections which involve Senate have not been used at Simon Fraser:

(d)   The Board has not consulted with Senate concerning the "maintenance of the University's real property".

(e)   The Board has not consulted with Senate regarding the conservation of the University's heritage sites (if any exist).

Sections 40 and 41 mention Senate in connection with the powers of Faculties. None of the roles identified have been part of recent practice at Simon Fraser.

Section 62 requires the President to "prepare and submit to the board an annual budget in consultation with the appropriate standing committee of the senate". (In Section 37 the establishment of this committee is permitted, not mandated.)

SRC has used this analysis of Senate in the University Act to inform our recommendations; we do not think it would be wise to re-fashion Senate so that it slavishly followed the detail of the Act. As far as we could ascertain, nothing that Senate is doing now is in violation of the Act.

V. An Overview of SFU's Senate and Senate Committees

A. Senate

Senate has 56 members as determined by the University Act and the decisions of Senate to add two ex officio members (Vice President Research and Dean of Graduate Studies and Associate Vice President, Academic). As required by the Act, Senate is chaired by the President and has an elected Vice Chair. Matters for decision are normally brought to Senate through the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules and exceptions require suspension of Senate's rules by a two-thirds vote of the meeting. Further information is available in the Senate Handbook.

B. Senate Committees

As stated earlier, there are 24 Senate committees. (See Appendix B for a list.) Their membership ranges from 4 (ESC) to 51 (SGSC); in total there are 291 members of Senate Committees. The estimated number of meetings per year is 119. The size and composition of Senate committees and the method of appointment and election for their members varies widely. Most Senate committees have ex officio administrators as Chairs and only a few have Vice Chairs.

As an aid in its consideration of Senate's committee structure, SRC prepared this functional classification of current Senate committees.

i.   Curriculum committees (SCUS, SGSC, ACNGP, CC)

ii.   Awards committees (SCHD, SPCSAB, SUAAC, SGAAC)

iii.   Adjudication and appeal committees (SAB, CRUA, SCODA, LPAC, DQAC)

iv.   Specialized committees (SLC, SCIA, ISEC, SCUTL, SCCS)

v.   Procedural committees (SCAR, SNC, ESC)

vi.   Planning committees (SCAP, SCUB, SCEMP)

C. Senate Meetings

1. Normally Senate meets 11 times per year (not in August). Most meetings begin at 7:00 p.m. but when the agenda is "light" meetings are scheduled to begin at 5:30 p.m. Meetings can only extend beyond 10:00 p.m. with the approval of the meeting. The timing of meetings has been controversial – some on-campus members would prefer afternoon meetings but these would prevent or, at the least, inhibit participation of the nine lay members of Senate. Senate has considered changing its usual meeting time before but has chosen to leave it unchanged. In 1998 an e-mail survey by SCAR produced a 24-15 vote in favour of the current meeting time. The Board of Governors, a majority of whose members are from outside the University, changed its meetings to 3:00 p.m. several years ago.

2. Senate attendance is far from perfect – the average absentee rate for the 1996-99 period was 35 percent. There are no penalties for erratic attendance and no sanctions for infrequent attendance through removal or suspension are possible because the University Act does not provide for them. SRC's analysis of Senate attendance for the 29 meetings in 1996-1999* follows.

---

* These are "Senate years" which run from June1st to May 3ist.

Senate Attendance 1996-1999

Category	Possible Total Attendance	No. of Absences	Absentee Rate
Ex Officio	348	104	30%
Faculty	696	196	28%
Students	348	151	43%
Convocation	116	65	56%
Order-in-Council	116	50	43%
Total	1624	566	35%

3. Considerable resentment was expressed in the SRC surveys about the replacement of ex officio members of Senate by acting administrators since elected members of Senate have no alternate system to allow them to name replacements. However, four of the 12 ex officio members of Senate are never replaced, and most replacements are faculty Senators, not other administrators.

Administrators who are replaced (Deans and University Librarian) were replaced 38 percent of the times they were absent in 1996-1999. Also, while other University policy specifically provides for the appointment of Acting Deans, the University Act does not include any language which would permit the replacement of elected Senators by alternates

4. Senate procedures are quite formal. Motions are presented for all decisions and their consideration is supposed to follow Roberts' Rules of Order. Many Senators are comfortable with this process for decision-making once they become familiar with it. Most believe that Senate is not asked to consider important issues and their concern is with the content of Senate meetings, not its procedures.

5. It is apparently widely believed that Senate spends much of its time debating minute curriculum details. SRC's analysis of the 177 agenda items considered in calendar 1998 and 1999 shows, however, that curriculum does not dominate the agenda; many curriculum matters have been delegated to Senate committees. While no information is available which would allow the time spent on various types of

agenda items to be analyzed, it is the belief of SRC that Senate spends more time on important University-wide issues than on matters of more local interest.

D. Senate Agendas

Senate agendas included 89 papers in the June, 1998 - May, 1999 Senate year. Forty of these papers were presented to Senate for information (e.g., most curriculum revisions and all committee annual reports) and almost all came from senate committees. In 1998/99 there were only two "private" Senator's motions, both at the same meeting. Curriculum matters (including approval of credentials) were the subject of 26 papers; the next largest topics were committee annual reports (8), committee terms of reference changes (6), elections (6), policies (5), and establishment or dissolution of centres and institutes (5). Three large development issues were brought to Senate for information – the faculty renewal task force draft report, the TIME Centre, and the Burnaby Mountain Community Corporation.

VI. A Statement of Purpose for Senate

SRC proposes the following as a statement of purpose for Senate.

"Senate is responsible for the academic governance of the University and so it must be concerned with all important matters that bear on teaching and research in the University; this includes the development of new initiatives, the formation of priorities, and the consideration and approval of policies. Senate's agenda should be open for informed debate of issues of significance for the whole University."

VII. Revitalizing Senate

A. New Approach to Agenda-Setting

This section sets out SRC's views on how to achieve a more open and relevant agenda process for Senate. Those responsible for implementing these recommendations are identified in square brackets.

1. SCAR should establish a process by which all members of the University community may request that a matter be considered by Senate. [SCAR/Senate]

2. SCAR should initiate a formal question period at the beginning of Senate on a trial basis. SRC suggests that written questions should be accepted up to three working days before Senate meets. Questions presented without notice might not be answered until the following Senate meeting. [SCAR/Senate]

3. The President should ensure that Senate considers all matters that fall within the proposed statement of purpose for Senate. [President]

4. Senate committees and the administration should make more effort to seek Senate's advice on issues and policies that are still "in-process". [Committee chairs, senior administrators]

5. Senate should agree to end the distribution of graduand lists; Senators could consult lists prior to a meeting at which graduands were to be recommended. [SCAR/Senate]

B. Reorganized Committee Structure

1. While SRC's survey found general support from committee chairs for the current organization of Senate committees, other input and consideration leads SRC to offer the following proposals for reform of the Senate committee system.

i.   SCUS and SGSC become committees reporting directly to Senate. Membership of each committee consists of two student members elected by Senate plus the chair of each Faculty-level committee plus one faculty member elected by each Faculty-level committee. The Chair of SCUS is the Vice President, Academic, or designate. The Chair of SGSC is the Dean of Graduate Studies

ii.   SCAP is renamed SCUP (university priorities) and its responsibilities re-oriented to oversight of the academic planning and review system. Its membership is changed to include 3 Deans selected by the Deans, the Vice President, Research, ⧸ one faculty Senators (no more than 2 from each Faculty), 2 student Senators elected by Senate, 1 lay Senator, and the Director of Analytical Studies as a non-voting member.

The Vice President, Academic is Chair and the Director, University Secretariat is Secretary.

iii.   SCUB is abolished and SCUP becomes the committee from which, according to section 62 of the University Act, the President must seek advice before presenting the University budget to the Board for approval.

iv.   LPAC becomes a sub-committee of SLC and its members are the SLC members elected by Senate .

v.   SCHD becomes the Senate Committee on University Honours (SCUH). This new committee would be responsible for making recommendations and decisions on a wider range of University awards and distinctions and would be expected to operate on a continuous basis. A second student position is added to the membership.

vi.   SCEMP becomes a committee reporting directly to Senate and its terms of reference are broadened to include graduate enrollment. SCEMP membership is expanded to include two faculty Senators elected by Senate, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and a graduate student. The existing student member becomes elected by Senate.

2. Restructured committees should be charged with reviewing their terms of reference for approval by Senate by September, 2000. (These committees include SCUS, SGSC, SCUP, SCUH, and SCEMP.)

3. All Senate committees should have a Vice Chair, selected by the members of each committee from among the members unless the Vice Chair is otherwise designated.

4. Unless otherwise specified, Senate committees should have a quorum of one-half of the voting members.

5. All nominations for election to Senate committees should be made by SNC.

C. Effective Procedures

1. All Senators should participate in the orientation offered by the Senate Secretariat; this program should include an introduction to Roberts' Rules.

2. "Committee of the whole" processes should be used more to allow Senate to engage in a larger number of wide-ranging debates and to expand its role beyond legislative processing.

3. SRC believes that the advantages of afternoon meetings may outweigh the advantages of evening meetings and suggests a one-year experiment with meetings starting at 3:30 p.m. beginning June 1, 2000.

4. Whenever possible, Senate committee meetings should be open.

D. Improved Information

1. Senate needs to make its importance and functions more widely known in the University. There should be more development of web-based information about what Senate does and how it does it..

2. The summary of Senate's actions should be distributed immediately after Senate meetings.

3. The orientation programs for new faculty and new students should include components dealing with University governance.

4. The annual report of the President required under section 62 (1) (a) of the University Act should contain a section on Senate.

5. The recommendations in the submission from Archives and Records are referred to the Dean of Student Services and Registrar and the Director, University Secretariat.

APPENDIX A

SENATE REVIEW COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP

Purpose

A routine examination of the organization and effectiveness of Senate and
its committees should be undertaken from time to time to ensure that Senate and its
committees are performing required functions and following
appropriate processes in a timely manner.   It is many years since the last
major review of the Senate structure took place. SCAR recommends that a
review should be undertaken in 1999 by an ad hoc committee appointed by and
reporting to SCAR.

Terms of Reference

The ad hoc committee will review the structure of Senate, to ensure that
the structure is efficient, effective and complies with the requirements of
the University Act.

Each committee will be asked to review its own existing terms of reference,
membership and processes and make suggestions for change where appropriate
to the ad hoc committee.

The University community will be asked to comment on the effectiveness of
Senate and its committees.

The ad hoc committee will coordinate the responses, prepare a draft plan
for reorganization if required, submit the draft plan to Senate and the
affected committees for comment and then prepare a final report.

This examination of structure and processes should take account of the
following principles:

1. That decision-making shall normally be achieved by no more than
three levels of decision -making bodies;

2. That decision-making shall normally be achieved within 4-6 months.

Time Frame

From the time of establishment, the committee should deliver its draft
suggestions within four months, and its final recommendations within six
months.

Membership

2 Faculty, 2 students, 1 administrator, all to be appointed by SCAR.   The committee should include at least one Senator or former Senator, and at least one person who has never been a Senator.

M.A. Gillies, faculty member
N. Janovicek, student
J.M. Munro, faculty member (Chair)
D. Preece, student
J.H. Waterhouse, administrator

APPENDIX B

CURRENT SENATE COMMITTEES

1. Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals (SCODA)
2. Senate Committee on Academic Planning (SCAP)
3. Senate Committee on University Budget (SCUB)
4. Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules (SCAR)
5. Senate Committee on Continuing Studies (SCCS)
6. Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)
7. Assessment Committee for New Graduate Programs (ACNGP)
8. Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees (SCHD)
9. Senate Library Committee (SLC)
10. Library Penalties Appeal Committee (LPAC)
11. Senate Nominating Committee (SNC)
12. Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries (SPCSAB)
13. Senate Undergraduate Awards Adjudication Committee (SUAAC)
14. Senate Graduate Awards Adjudication Committee (SGAAC)
15. Senate Appeals Board (SAB)
16. Committee to Review University Admissions (CRUA)
17. Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUS)
18. Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning (SCEMP)
19. Electoral Standing Committee (ESC)
20. Senate Committee on International Activities (SCIA)
21. International Student Exchange Committee (ISEC)
22. Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL)
23. Diverse Qualifications Adjudication Committee (DQAC)
24. Calendar Committee (CC)

APPENDIX C

COMPARISONS WITH OTHER UNIVERSITIES

1. University of British Columbia Senate

Administrators including Chancellor	17
Faculty	34
Students	17
Convocation members	11
Affiliated college members	3
Order in Council	4
Other (rep of Professional Lib.)	1
Total Number of Senators	**87**

Standing Committees
1. Academic Building Needs
2. Academic Policy
3. Admissions
4. Agenda
5. Appeals on Academic Standing
6. Budget
7. Continuing Studies
8. Curriculum
9. Elections
10. Liaison with Post-Secondary Institutions
11. Library
12. Nominating
13. Student Appeals on Academic Decisions
14. Student Awards
15. Tributes
16. Joint Board/Senate Committee on Policy for use of donor's names at UBC

The UBC Curriculum Committee deals with undergraduate and graduate material (graduate material coming from the Graduate Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies). Material comes in two forms: Category 1 – major changes including new courses and Category 2 – minor changes. Graduation lists do not get distributed to Senators (too much paper). They reside with and may be consulted at the Senate Secretariat office. UBC traditionally schedules 9 Senate meetings a year, and 1 (February) often gets cancelled.

2. University of Victoria Senate

Administrators including Chancellor	16
Faculty	32
Students	16
Convocation members	4
Order in Council	4
Other (Prof. Librarian, P-T student)	2

Total Number of Senators   **74**

Standing Committees
1. Committee on Academic Standards
2. Committee on Admissions, Re-registration and Transfer
3. Committee on Agenda and Procedures
4. Committee on Appeals
5. Committee on Awards
6. Committee on Committees
7. Committee on Continuing Studies
8. Committee on Curriculum GS UG
9. Committee on Honorary Degrees and Other Forms of Recognition
10. Committee on the Libraries
11. Committee on Planning
12. Committee on Teaching and Learning
13. Committee on University Budget

The Committee on Curriculum deals with undergraduate and graduate curriculum and meets once a year.   Minor curriculum revisions come from the Faculties and go directly to the University Secretary/Registrar for inclusion in the calendar.   Major curriculum changes go to the December meeting of the Curriculum Committee and the January meeting of Senate.   The Committee on Planning considers new programs, at both the Letter of Intent and the Full Program Proposal stages.

The Committee on Committees covers nominations and orientation and terms of reference and membership of committees. It reviews appointments of chairs of committees annually and recommends members and chairs to Senate.

3. University of Calgary General Faculties Council (97 members)

Standing Committees
1. Academic Awards Committee
2. Academic Program Committee
3. Ad Hoc Review Committee for Non-Academic Misconduct
4. Appointment, Promotion and Dismissal Committee
5. Calendar Submissions Committee
6. Committee on Admissions and Transferability
7. Committee on the Ethics of Human Studies
8. Committee to Hear and Determine Student Academic Appeals
9. Executive Committee

10. Facilities and Services Planning Committee
11. Library Committee
12. Research Development and Policy Committee
13. Striking Committee
14. University International Grants Committee
15. University Planning Committee
16. University Research Grants Committee

4. University of Guelph Senate (164 members)

Standing Committees
1. Executive Committee
2. Committee on Bylaws and Membership
3. Board of Undergraduate Studies
4. Board of Graduate Studies
5. Research Board
6. Library Committee
7. Committee on Student Petitions
8. Committee on Awards
9. Committee on University Planning
10. International Committee
11. Committee on Open Learning

Guelph's Boards of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies have committees reporting to them and they have delegated authority to deal with minor changes; only major changes go through to the Boards.

5. University of Waterloo Senate (89 members)

Standing Committees
1. Executive Committee
2. Long Range Planning Committee
3. Finance Committee
4. Honorary Degrees Committee
5. Honorary Member of the University
6. Scholarships and Student Aid Committee
7. Undergraduate Council
8. Graduate Council
9. Research Council
10. University Committee on Student Appeals

6. York University Senate (190 members)

Standing Committees
1. Academic Policy and Planning Committee
2. Executive Committee
3. Committee on Curriculum and Academic Standards
4. Senate Appeals Committee
5. Library Committee

6.   Committee on Research
7.   Committee on Admissions, Recruitment and Student Assistance
8.   Committee on Tenure and Promotions
9.   Tenure Appeals Committee
10.   Committee on Academic Computing
11.   Committee on Non-Faculty Colleges
12.   Committee on Teaching and Learning
13.   Review Committee on Faculty of Grad. Studies appointments

7. Dalhousie University Senate (70 members)

Standing Committees
1.   Academic Administration
2.   Academic Appeals
3.   Academic Priorities and Budget
4.   Computing and Information Technology Planning
5.   Discipline
6.   Environment
7.   Honorary Degrees Committee
8.   Instructional Development
9.   Library
10.   Nominating Committee
11.   Ombudsperson Advisory Committee
12.   Physical Planning Committee
13.   Steering Committee

The overview shows that the comparison universities have a smaller number of committees than SFU despite having the same or a wider range of responsibilities (such as Calgary and York which have committees dealing with appointments, promotions, tenure and tenure appeals).

A number of the committees have a wide range of responsibilities under the umbrella of one committee; for example, the UVic Committee on Appeals deals with all academic student appeals.

APPENDIX D

IMPORTANT UNIVERSITY ACT SECTIONS

(s. 35, 36, 37)

35   Senate

(1) The senate for each university is continued.

(2) The senate of each university is composed of the following:

(a) the chancellor;

(b) the president, who is its chair;

(c) the academic vice president or equivalent;

(d) the deans of faculties;

(e) the chief librarian;

(f) the director of continuing education;

(g) a number of faculty members equal to twice the number provided in paragraphs (a) to (f), to consist of 2 members of each faculty elected by the members of that faculty, and the remainder elected by all the faculty members in the manner that they, in joint meeting, determine;

(h) a number of full time students, equal to the number provided in paragraphs (a) to (f), elected from the student association in a manner that ensures that at least one student from each faculty is elected;

(i) 4 persons who are not faculty members, elected by and from the convocation;

(j) 4 persons appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council;

(k) one member to be elected by the governing body of each affiliated college of the university;

(l) additional members the senate may determine without altering the ratio set out in paragraphs (g) and (h).

36   Term of office

(1) The term of office of a member of the senate, other than one elected under section 35 (2) (h), is 3 years and after that until a successor is appointed or elected.

(2) The term of office of a member of the senate elected under section 35 (2) (h) is one year and after that until a successor is elected.

(3) Members of a senate who remain eligible under section 35 may be reappointed or re-elected in the manner provided under section 35 for further terms.

(4) If a vacancy arises on the senate, the vacancy must be filled,

(a) in the case of an appointed member, by the body possessing the power of appointment, or

(b) in the case of an elected member, in the manner specified by the senate.

(5) A person appointed or elected to fill a vacancy holds office for the remainder of the term for which the person's predecessor was appointed or elected.

(6) The secretary of the senate must enter a declaration of the vacancy in the minutes of the senate.

(7) A declaration under subsection (6) is conclusive evidence of the vacancy.

37   Powers of senate

(1) The academic governance of the university is vested in the senate and it has the following powers:

(a) to regulate the conduct of its meetings and proceedings, including the determination of the quorum necessary for the transaction of its business, and the election of a vice chair at least annually, who is to chair meetings in the absence of the president;

(b) to establish committees it considers necessary and, by 2/3 vote of its members present, to delegate to one or more committees those of its powers as it may determine;

(c) to determine all questions relating to the academic and other qualifications required of applicants for admission as students to the university or to any faculty, and to determine in which faculty the students pursuing a course of study must register;

(d) to determine the conditions under which candidates must be received for examination, to appoint examiners and to determine the conduct and results of all examinations;

(e) to establish a standing committee to meet with the president and assist the president in preparing the university budget;

(f) to consider, approve and recommend to the board the revision of courses of study, instruction and education in all faculties and departments of the university;

(g) to provide for courses of study in any place in British Columbia and to encourage and develop extension and correspondence programs;

(h) to provide for and to grant degrees, including honorary degrees, diplomas and certificates of proficiency, except in theology;

(i) to recommend to the board the establishment or discontinuance of any faculty, department, course of instruction, chair, fellowship, scholarship, exhibition, bursary or prize;

(j) to award fellowships, scholarships, exhibitions, bursaries and prizes;

(k) to determine the members of the teaching and administrative staffs who are to be members of each faculty;

(l) to make rules for the management and conduct of the library;

(m) to establish policies regarding the conservation of heritage objects and collections that are owned by or in the possession of the university or any of its faculties, divisions, departments or other agencies;

(n) to provide for the preparation and publication of a university calendar;

(o) to make recommendations to the board considered advisable for promoting the interests of the university or for carrying out the objects and provisions of this Act;

(p) to deal with all matters reported by the faculties, affecting their respective departments or divisions;

(q) to establish a standing committee to consider and take action on behalf of the senate on all matters that may be referred to the senate by the board;

(r) subject to the approval of the board, to enter into agreements with any corporation or society in British Columbia entitled under any Act to establish examinations for admission to the corporation or society, for the purpose of conducting examinations and reporting results, and those corporations or societies have power to enter into the agreements;

(s) to make rules respecting the conduct and financing of examinations referred to in paragraph (r) and other examinations conducted by the senate under any other Act;

(t) to make rules respecting the reporting of results of examinations referred to in paragraphs (r) and (s);

(u) to set the terms of affiliation with other universities, colleges or other institutions of learning, and to modify or terminate the affiliation;

(v) to establish a standing committee of final appeal for students in matters of academic discipline;

(w) to establish a standing committee on relations with other post secondary institutions in British Columbia;

(x) to require any faculty to establish an advisory committee consisting of students of the faculty and members of the community at large.

(2) A vice chair elected under subsection (1) (a) must not serve more than 2 consecutive terms.

(3) No part of the cost of examinations referred to in subsection (1) (r) or (s) may be a charge on or be paid out of university funds.