



MINUTES OF MEETING #9 (2007-08)

**SENATE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 2008, 3:00 PM

SANKEY CHAMBER, MACKENZIE CHOWN COMPLEX

PRESENT: Professor Rick Cheel (Chair), Professor Tansu Barker, Mr. Patrick Beard, Professor Irene Blayer, Professor Maureen Connolly, Mr. Mike Farrell (Recorder), Professor Greg Finn, Professor William Mathie, Mr. Tim Ribaric, Dean David Siegel, Professor Mary Louise Vanderlee

REGRETS: Mr. Justin Carre, Dean Martin Kusy, Mr. Damien O'Brien

Professor Cheel called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

**1. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the Senate Governance Committee (2007-08) meeting #8 held March 5, 2008 were circulated prior to the meeting.

**MOVED** (Vanderlee/Siegel)

**That the minutes of the Senate Governance Committee (2007-08) meeting #8 held March 5, 2008 be approved.**

**CARRIED**

**2. Academic Reviews**

**a) Academic Review Manual for Departments/Centres**

As a follow-up from the previous meeting, the Committee reviewed the *Academic Review Manual for Departments/Centres* which was drafted by Mr. Beard and distributed prior to the meeting. The Committee discussed the Academic Review Schedule of proposed timelines and no changes were suggested.

**b) Timelines and Penalties for Late Submissions**

The Committee discussed the various problems associated with the late submission of Academic Review documents including possible penalties/sanctions that could be imposed and who is responsible for the timely submission of the material.

The role that the Undergraduate Program Committee could have in this matter was discussed. It was agreed that the issue would be raised with the Undergraduate Program Committee at its next meeting scheduled for April 11, 2008. Professor Connolly would be in attendance during the meeting and would raise the matter and report back to the Committee.

**c) Memo and the Brock University Response to UPRAC Report**

Mr. Beard briefly reviewed the memo from Mr. Roy Fischer, Coordinator, Undergraduate Program Review Audits, dated February 29, 2008 and the *Brock University Response to UPRAC Report*, which were distributed with the meeting materials.

About a year ago, the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents received the *Report of the Auditors on Undergraduate Program Reviews at Brock University*. The last step in that audit is the follow-up on the recommendations of the Auditors. *UPRAC Review and Audit Guidelines* state that: Within a year of publication of the final report, the institution must inform OCAV, through the Auditors, of the steps taken as a result of the recommendations in the report.

The one-year follow-up response identifies specifically where policy and procedures have been amended in light of each of the recommendations made by the Auditors. Also, explanations are provided if recommendations have not been adopted. The response indicates that it has been considered by the person or committee identified in the policy as the “authority responsible for the application of the policy.” The report includes the University’s responses to a number of suggestions made by the Auditors.

The report would be forwarded to Senate for information on April 9, 2008.

**MOVED** (Finn/Mathie)

**That the *Brock University Response to UPRAC Report* dated April 2, 2008, be approved.**

**CARRIED**

**3. Faculty Handbook Appointment Procedures**

**a) Timeline: FHB Review re Advisory Committees for the Appointment/Reappointment of Senior Academic and Administrative Officers**

Professor Cheel noted that the draft report on revisions to the procedures for the appointment/reappointment of senior academic and administrative officers as outlined in Section I of the Faculty Handbook would be provided, for discussion and advice, to Senate on April 9, 2008. The Governance Committee had reviewed the document during its meeting on March 5, 2008.

Any comments from Senate would be taken into consideration and the document would be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for consideration on May 1, 2008.

The sub-committee reviewing the procedures includes the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board, the Chair of Senate and the Chair of the Senate Governance Committee. The final authority for establishing the procedures rests with the Board of Trustees.

**b) Process for nominations to the Advisory Committee for the Appointment of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic**

Professor Cheel briefly reviewed the process for making the appointments to the various advisory committees that was approved by Senate. This process provides an opportunity for all eligible faculty members to be nominated for consideration to serve on each respective advisory committee.

A call for nominations for the composition of the advisory committee to conduct the search for the Provost and Vice-President, Academic would soon be made. The Governance Committee would review all nominations received and forward its recommendations for membership on each advisory committee to the President for consideration.

**4. Report of the Sub-Committee re Honorary Degrees**

Professor Barker and Professor Mathie distributed a draft report for the consideration of the Committee during its next meeting. The sub-committee did not have an opportunity to meet with the President to discuss the draft. Any comments regarding the draft were to be forwarded to Professor Barker before the next meeting. Mr. Farrell would circulate the draft to those Committee members not in attendance.

**5. Organizational Nomenclature Review**

This item would be considered during the next meeting of the Committee.

**6. Enforcement of the Faculty Handbook**

This item would be removed from the agenda as Mr. O'Brien would not be available to address the matter.

**7. Information re Honorary Degree Nomination – *in camera***

Professor Cheel noted that a motion was required to move *in camera*.

**MOVED** (Vanderlee/Finn)

**That the Governance Committee move *in camera*.**

**CARRIED**

The Committee moved *in camera* at 4:12 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Committee resumed **open session** at 4:21 p.m.

[During the *in camera* session, the Committee discussed whether it would review outstanding Honorary Degree nominations at its next meeting.]

**8. Other business**

There was no other business.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.