



Executive Committee

Report to Academic Council
at its meeting of September 21, 2010

FOR ACTION

1. Academic Council Membership

The Executive Committee recommends:

That Academic Council amend the membership of Academic Council to include the Vice-President, External Relations in the place of the Vice-President, Student Services as an ex-officio, voting member.

Rationale

In June 2009, Academic Council put forward a series of amendments to the Academic Council membership, including updating the list of ex-officio, voting members of Academic Council to reflect changes in titles and positions that had taken place up to that time. The Vice-President Student Services position, which has held a seat on this body since 2003, was not altered as the position at that time continued to oversee student services at both UOIT and Durham College. Since then, however, responsibility for the UOIT student services portfolio has shifted to the Vice-President, External Relations. Thus, the Executive Committee is recommending that the Vice-President, External Relations position be added as an ex-officio member of Academic Council in the place of the Vice-President, Student Services to ensure that this key student-oriented position continues to be represented as part of its membership.

2. Nominations to Academic Council

The Executive Committee recommends:

That the following individuals be appointed to serve as members of Academic Council and its standing committees for three year terms (to June 30, 2013):

a) Academic Council

Ahmad Barari, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science

Terry Wu, Professor, Faculty of Business and Information Technology (Fall 2010 term only as a temporary replacement for John Friedlan)

b) Executive Committee

Mikael Eklund, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science

Janette Hughes, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education

c) Academic Appeals Committee

Barbara Perry, Professor, Faculty of Social Science and Humanities (as chair)

Hélène Leblanc, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Science

d) Curriculum and Program Review Committee

Paul Yelder, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Health Sciences

Mikael Eklund, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science

3. Academic Council Standing Rule on Substantive Motions

The Executive Committee recommends:

That Academic Council consider the adoption of one of the options below for the introduction of substantive motions at Academic Council:

Option 1 (current rule): *Substantive motions propose that Academic Council exercise its authority to achieve a specified substantive objective. Notice of consideration of a substantive motion must be provided to members in advance of the meeting circulated with the agenda.*

Option 2 (amendment to current rule): *Substantive motions propose that Academic Council exercise its authority to achieve a specified substantive objective. Notice of consideration of a substantive motion must be provided to members in advance of the meeting circulated with the agenda. To be considered without prior notice, such motions will require the consent of two-thirds of Academic Council present and voting.*

Option 3 (amendment to current rule): *Substantive motions propose that Academic Council exercise its authority to achieve a specified substantive objective. Notice of consideration of a substantive motion must be provided to members in advance of the meeting circulated with the agenda. To be considered without prior notice, such motions will require the unanimous consent of Academic Council present and voting.*

Rationale

At the June 2010 Academic Council meeting, the Executive Committee presented a two-part amendment to the Academic Council standing rules that would require advance notice to be given for all substantive motions, and that would establish a procedure for the introduction of substantive motions on the floor. The two-part amendment was aimed at promoting meaningful participation and informed decision making at all levels by ensuring that major academic initiatives and policy changes are available to members for review before a meeting, while at the same time provide a process that would enable new business to be attended to at a specific meeting if it is determined by the members to do so. The first part of the amendment was approved at the June meeting, but the second part of the amendment was referred back to the Executive Committee for further examination.

Over the summer months, the Provost's office undertook to review the ways in which our sister universities and parliamentary bodies deal with these motions. We found that many formal rules of order do allow for the introduction of substantive motions at a meeting without prior notice; most, however, require the approval of 2/3 of the members present to permit this action. Indeed, of the 14 university senate/academic council rules of order reviewed, most use the 2/3 rule – three do not allow substantive motions from the floor, one applies the higher standard of unanimous consent, and the remainder apply either the 2/3 rule or a lesser majority. King & Kerr and Robert's formal rules of order also specify a two-thirds vote to introduce a substantive motion without prior notice. Discussion on this item at the June Academic Council also centred on the ways in which the council may then choose to dispose of the motion (approve, refer, change voting procedure, etc.), but the Committee was satisfied that these procedures are appropriately dealt with elsewhere in the Council's standing rules and the *Democratic Rules of Order* dealing with motions and actions taken.

Above, the Committee has proposed three possible options for Council's consideration. The first involve no change to the current Academic Council rules by requiring that all substantive motions be circulated in advance of the meeting at which they are considered, thereby eliminating any option that such items can be introduced on the floor. The second option requires the consent of two-thirds of the members present, and the third option requires the higher standard of unanimous consent to regulate the introduction of new business at a meeting.

4. Academic Council Standing Rule on Quorum for Faculty Councils

The Executive Committee recommends:

That Academic Council approve the following amendment to the standing rules of Academic Council Section IV, 2. (b) on Quorum:

Quorum for Academic Council committees is a simple majority of the voting members. Quorum for Faculty Councils is a simple majority of the number of voting members minus the number of faculty on leave. Committees may establish a lower quorum for meetings to be held between May 31 and September 30.

Rationale

At the June 2010 Academic Council meeting, the Executive Committee was asked to look into the terms of reference of Faculty Councils, specifically as it relates to quorum rules respecting members of faculty who are on research, maternity or other forms of leave from the university.

According to the current standing rules of Academic Council, quorum for Faculty Councils requires a simple majority of its voting members to be present in order to conduct its business. In determining the number of voting members, one would include in the count, among others:

*“all core faculty members of the Faculty with a primary appointment in the Faculty **including those on sabbatical or leave**” [emphasis added, and see attached for the full terms of reference of Faculty Councils]*

The specific reference in this provision to faculty members on leave from the university indicates that the original legislation was intended to be as inclusive of the full time academic complement as possible. While it is expected that faculty members on leave will have no administrative or committee service commitments during the time they are on leave, their inclusion in the membership would not disallow their vote in Faculty Council deliberations if they choose to participate. This more inclusive provision, however, may make it difficult for some Faculty Councils to achieve the quorum of a simple majority, as there may be occasions where more than 25% of the faculty complement is absent from the university for one type of leave or another, leaving little room for other types of absences of the remaining members. A cursory review of the standing rules of other Faculty Councils in universities across the province reveals that faculty on research or other types of leaves would generally be excluded from the membership for the purposes of quorum. Thus, the above amendment is intended to enable faculty members on leave to remain as members of this body and so can attend meetings, vote on motions and fully participate as voting members if they so choose, but for the purposes of establishing a number for quorum, the number of individuals on leave would be subtracted from the total number of members.

FOR INFORMATION

5. 2010 UOIT Teaching Awards (revised)

The Committee extends its congratulations to the recipients of the 2010 UOIT Teaching Awards:

a) Core Faculty Teaching Award

- Ellen Vogel, Associate Professor, Faculty of Health Sciences

b) Complementary Faculty Teaching Award

- Rupinder Brar, Lecturer, Faculty of Science

c) Teaching Assistant Award

- Gavin Lobo, Teaching Assistant, Faculty of Science

The selection committee for this year's competition was comprised of Carla Cesaroni (Social Science and Humanities and 2009 Teaching Award recipient - core), Anthony Waker (Energy Systems and Nuclear Science), Bill Kapralos (Business and Information Technology), and Hélène-Marie Gouling (Health Sciences, and 2009 Teaching Award recipient - complementary).

6. Summer Authority

The terms of reference of the Academic Council Executive Committee state that:

During the summer months, the Executive Committee will act on behalf of Academic Council and the Executive Committee will report to the Academic Council, at its first regular meeting in September, what action has been taken under this authority.

At the end of June, Academic Council Executive Committee received a request from the Board of Governors for the nomination of three representatives of Academic Council, two faculty members and one academic administrator, to serve on the Presidential Search Committee. To this end, the Executive Committee invited interested members to put forward nominations for these positions. In its call, the Committee detailed the expectations of the appointees and the criteria by which the final names would be selected. Specifically, the Committee indicated that it is looking to achieve in its recommendation the best possible balance in terms of gender, career rank and disciplinary interests among the three names that would be put forward.

At the close of nominations on July 5, 2010, six nominations were received and the Committee subsequently met to select the three individuals who together would meet the above criteria in the broadest possible terms. All nominees were also continuing or incoming members of Academic Council and were nominated for this position by a current member of their constituent group (i.e., the faculty representatives were nominated by faculty colleagues, the academic administrator was nominated by an academic administrator). Each nominee had also indicated his/her willingness to invest a substantial amount of time in the search process, and to adhere to strict standards of confidentiality on all matters related to the search committee's work.

Consequently, the Executive Committee recommended that the following individuals be appointed to serve as the Academic Council representatives on the Presidential Search Committee: Mary Bluehardt, Dean and Professor, Health Sciences, Ronald Hinch, Professor, Social Science and Humanities, and Faisal Qureshi, Assistant Professor, Science.

In putting forward its recommendation, the Committee noted that President Bordessa and Provost Marceau, as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee, were not involved in any way in these deliberations.