



SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE
 Tuesday, May 27, 2014 2:00 pm Multipurpose Room

MINUTES

PRESENT: Kris Bulcroft (Chair), Tammy Towill, Carol Aitken, Stephen Atkins, Jean Bennett, Don Bentley, Chris Bottrill, Brent Calvert, Leighan Crowe, Graham Fane, Darin Feist, Rick Gale, Violet Jessen, David Kirk, Brent Leigh, Clay Little, Nanci Lucas, Karen McCredie, Kim McLeod, Paul McMillan, Jennifer Moore, Natahsha Prakash, Sandra Seekins, Daniel Yasinski, Secretary: Mary Jukich

REGRETS: Brittany Barnes, Julia Denholm, Devon Gregory, Brandon Hofmarks, Cherry Itty, Reini Klein, Grace Makarewicz, Joanne Quirk, Emma Russell, Sharka Stuyt, Peter Ufford

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

A request was presented on whether Senate was willing to allow, at this meeting, a notice of motion to further revise the Senate by-laws with regard to the Election of the Vice-Chair, with discussion and debate of the motion at the June 3rd meeting. The proposed further revision to the by-laws will include allowing the elected, non-voting members of Senate to run for the position of Vice-Chair.

Graham Fane moved and Kim McLeod seconded that:

14/32 Notice of motion to permit changes in the Senate by-laws with the new addition when considering electing a Vice-Chair to include all elected members.

CARRIED
 14 YES
 1 NO
 3 ABSTENTIONS

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Natahsha Prakash moved and Jennifer Moore seconded that:
 The amended agenda be approved.

CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Special Meeting of Senate – May 6, 2014

As a matter of procedure, approval of the minutes will be undertaken at the Regular Meeting of Senate on June 3rd.

3. BY-LAW, POLICY AND PROCEDURE COMMITTEE

Discontinuance of Programs or Courses Policy
Presented by: Nanci Lucas

Senate was provided with a summary of the Committee's process to date and their approach to the Board's draft policy. It was noted that the Committee looked at the implications of possible wordsmithing of the document; however,



SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE
Tuesday, May 27, 2014 2:00 pm Multipurpose Room

MINUTES

the Committee felt that word changes should be the responsibility of the Board.

An overview of the feedback received on the draft policy was also provided. Three common themes; process, interim/expiry date, and criteria list, were evident in the feedback, and Senate was provided with explanations of each theme.

A summary of the proposed advice on the draft policy from the Committee to the Board was also provided to Senate.

A concern was raised with regard to the criteria list in that the criteria had not been discussed at either Senate or with faculty. There was also a lack of understanding where the criteria came from, and that criteria presented last year was not listed on the draft policy. Concern continued that it may be difficult to understand how decisions are made with the criteria, as written, on the draft policy.

A suggestion was presented to remove the criteria; however, it was explained that the University was advised by legal counsel that criteria was, in fact, required to put this interim policy on safe ground. Senate was reminded that when the policy is revised in September, there will be an opportunity for further discussion and consultation on criteria.

A member noted that the first policy developed by Senate did not include criteria and there was no Board discussion about the criteria noted on the draft policy.

Discomfort was noted that the criteria could be seen as broad and that it did not reflect, and was not similar to, the suggested wording from the CFA. Concern was expressed that if criteria was included, process steps are required. As well, it was suggested that an expiry date is included in the policy to ensure the Board is accountable for a further review of the policy.

Further discomfort was noted with having criteria without procedures. The role of the Executive versus the Senate on how criteria and procedures might be implemented was raised as Senate is responsible for academic governance.

The University Executive has to define its procedure on how to make its decision on discontinuance. A "two-prong" process would be in place that before any decisions on discontinuance are made, the Board would get input from both the Executive and Senate.

A member requested clarification on how the concerns and issues would be presented to the Board as Senate would not be voting on the document and numerous concerns and issues were raised. It was noted that the Board will be



SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE
Tuesday, May 27, 2014 2:00 pm Multipurpose Room

MINUTES

provided with the Senate package, Board members on Senate, (Brent Leigh and Natahsha Prakash) would pass the information to the Board, and the Board will be provided with the Senate minutes.

Senators were reminded that the policy is required to be in place before the budget is recommended to the Board at its June 10th meeting. It was noted that the Budget Advisory Committee will be meeting on June 3rd prior to the Senate meeting to determine that, if the draft policy is accepted by the Board, whether the Committee still recommends the budget.

If the policy has to proceed, the process was questioned to ensure the concerns noted will be revisited.

Senators were informed that the Board passed a motion to create an ad hoc committee to begin the process, and will expand to include the bodies involved.

In order to ensure that communication is maintained, Senators are kept apprised of the Board's progress on the draft policy, and that concerns are revisited, it was suggested that the Board policy be a standing item on the Senate agenda.

Sandra Seekins moved and Rick Gale seconded that:

14/33 Discontinuance of Programs or Courses Policy be a standing item on the Senate agenda.

CARRIED

There being no further business, and on motion duly made, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 3, 2014
