

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SENATE**

**DECEMBER 9, 2016**

The meeting was held at 1:30 p.m. in Room 1R40, Arts and Humanities Building.

SENATORS: 71

A. Abuhussein	A. Hrymak	H. Orbach-Miller
R. Andersen	Y. Huang	G. Parraga
A. Bachman	M. Jadd	I. Paul
A. Bhatt	C. Jones	B. Paxton
P. Bishop	D. Jorgensen	M. Pratt
A. Bowlus	A. Katz	D. Rogers
J. Capone	M. Knott	C. Roulston
T. Carmichael	J. Knowles	B. Rubin
A. Chakma	A. Kothari	J. Scarfone
A. Chant	D. Laird	V. Schwean
K. Cole	R. MacDougall	D. Simmonds
R. Collins	S. Macfie	Z. Sinel
E. Comor	E. Macpherson	V. Staroverov
M. Crossan	L. McKivior	C. Steeves
C. Davidson	K. Mequanint	M. Strong
J. Deakin	J. Michalski	M. Thomson
C. Dean	M. Milde	G. Tigert
G. Dekaban	L. Miller	S. Trosow
P. Doyle	S. Mumm	T. Tucker
N. Dyer-Witthford	K. Myers	Z. Turner
J. Garland	P. Nesbitt-Larking	M. Viczko
C. Hardy	V. Nielsen	C. Wang
J. Hatch	C. O'Connor	BA. Younker
E. Hegedues	C. Olivier	

Observers: E. Avila, A. Bigelow, K. Campbell, E. Chamberlain, R. Chelladurai, A. Di Sebastiano, J. Doerksen, L. Gribbon, T. Hinan, J. Luker, J. McMullin, J. Sadler

S.16-250 **Land Acknowledgement**

A. Bachman read the Land Acknowledgement.

S.16-251 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting of November 18, 2016 were approved as circulated.

Referring to the second paragraph in S.16-224, Minutes of the Previous Meeting, that describes Dr. Chakma's response to the question about the appropriateness of the Visiting Elder's opening at the October meeting, a member asked why there was no mention of the religious element in the minutes. The Secretary took the question under advisement.

Secretary's note: Dr. Chakma addressed a comment received outside of Senate that some members of the community took issue with the religious nature of the greetings provided at the beginning of the October Senate meeting because Western is a secular institution. He noted that the invitation to have the Visiting Elder open the meeting was extended to show respect for the indigenous community and to recognize the importance of the Indigenous Strategic Plan process as a step towards trying to rectify the historical challenges they have faced. He added that having an Elder bring greetings or blessings is an important element of their culture and he did not believe the Elder's greeting diminished the secular character of Western. However, he acknowledged that others might disagree. He noted that this was a very special case and what was done was in the spirit of showing respect to the indigenous communities. It was a unique situation, not likely to be repeated.

S.16-252 **Agenda for December 9 Senate Meeting**

It was moved by N. Dyer-Witthford, seconded by H. Orbach-Miller,

That the agenda for the December 9 Senate meeting be re-ordered to allow consideration of the questions from the Organizing Equality Student Coalition as the first item of business.

CARRIED

S.16-253 **Questions from the Organizing Equality Student Coalition**

The following questions were presented on behalf of the Organizing Equality Student Coalition.

*"Will the Senate take timely and concrete steps to address the systemic and specific harm experienced by marginalized students on campus, by providing funds and other institutional resources to organizations and projects led by students from equity seeking groups, for equity building activities that involve and benefit them as a priority?"*

The Provost said that it is important to remember that both Senate and the Board have taken concrete steps to ensure equity and inclusion for all members of the University community. In keeping with their governance role, both bodies have approved policies, such as the one on non-discrimination/harassment, that set expectations for behaviour and provide processes for dealing with concerns.

*Furthermore, will the Senate and Administration make designated physical spaces available for such students and groups to foster dialogue, mutual support and caucusing?*

The Provost explained that access to space, including classrooms when they are not being used, can be provided by the Faculties or the University centrally through the room booking service.

*Finally, will the Senate and Administration enthusiastically support such student-led initiatives, and thereby send a public message that helps engender safety for such students?*

The Provost said that a crucial part of the student experience at Western is to become engaged in initiatives that benefit the broader community, and the initiative in support of equity is a wonderful example of this. Student leaders have demonstrated their effective engagement in meetings with dozens of students and have detailed their productive impact to Equity Services and others.

S.16-254 **Notice of Motion regarding Land Acknowledgement**

It was moved by S. Macfie, seconded by A. Bhatt,

That Senate begin its meetings with the Land Acknowledgement.

CARRIED

S.16-255 **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

The President's report distributed with the agenda contained information on the following topics: U15 Proposal for 2017 Federal Budget, Royal Society Gala in Kingston, Board approval of the Indigenous Strategic Plan, and a leadership update. He also reported on "Ottawa Day" which involved taking a small group of Western faculty/staff to meet with Bob Hamilton, Deputy Minister University Champion assigned by the Privy Council to Western. Positive feedback was received from those who participated. The initiative aims to strengthen relationships and links between the Government of Canada and universities. He updated Senators on the federal government's Report of the Standing Committee on Finance and referenced the U15 Budget 2017 Proposal regarding advocacy for increased support for fundamental research attached as Annex 1 to his report.

**REPORT OF THE OPERATIONS/AGENDA COMMITTEE** [Exhibit III]

S.16-256 **Appointment Procedures for Senior Academic and Administrative Officers of the University: Amendment of Title in Section G: Vice-President (Resources & Operations)**

It was moved by M. Milde, seconded by P. Bishop,

That the title of the Vice-President (Resources & Operations) in the Appointment Procedures for Senior Academic and Administrative Officers of the University (Section G) be changed to Vice-President (Finance & Operations).

CARRIED

S.16-257 **Amendments to Senate Election Procedures**

It was moved by M. Milde, seconded by H. Orbach-Miller,

That the amendments to the Senate Election Procedures, attached as Exhibit III, Appendix 1, be approved.

CARRIED

S.16-258 **Recommendations of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Renewal**

As has been reported at Senate in the last two months, the Operations/Agenda Committee has continued to work on the implementation of recommendations contained in the Report of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Renewal.

The progress report attached as Exhibit III, Appendix 2 contained four recommendations on issues that OAC felt were ready for discussion and vote at Senate.

S.16-258a

**Open or Closed Committee Meetings**

It was moved by M. Milde, seconded by M. Strong,

That meetings of Senate's standing committees and subcommittees remain closed.

M. Milde, Chair of OAC, referred to the reasoning behind keeping meetings of Senate's standing committees and subcommittees closed contained in Exhibit III, Appendix 2, page 2. Each standing committee had debated the issue at length and concluded that their meetings should remain closed.

The Chairs of SCAPA, SCUP and Nominating were called upon to present their committee's rationale for having closed meetings:

T. Carmichael, Vice-Chair of the Nominating Committee, said that full discussion of the nominees and their suitability for service on committees can only occur in a closed session. The Nominating Committee's terms of reference will be revised to clarify the Committee's procedures including a new requirement that a paragraph be submitted outlining the reasons for each nomination and the nominee's suitability for the role.

S. Macfie, Chair of SCAPA, advised she submitted a written report to the Secretariat. Senator Trosow had been invited to the last SCAPA meeting to present his views on open meetings. Following his presentation, SCAPA again debated the merits of open and closed meetings and remained in favour of their decision to recommend that SCAPA meetings remain closed. She presented a summary of the committee's rationale noting that SCAPA is a policy oversight committee and not the place to further develop proposals arising from SUPR-U, SUPR-G, SGPS, GEC or DAP. SCAPA supports the recommendation that the meeting agenda page be posted for Senators and the community at large. She said that SCAPA receives more detailed information than is forwarded to Senate some of which is best kept confidential, including information about deficiencies noted by program reviewers. She concluded that all Senators should be involved in the final decision making process and that is best done at Senate meetings.

D. Laird, Chair of SCUP, reported that the Committee considered the recommendation to have open meetings as part of an overall desire to increase transparency of SCUP activities as well as the need to have more input into University planning from the University community at large. The Committee agreed to increase the membership of SCUP by six members to both increase transparency and provide a better balance between ex officio members and elected voting members. Posting the agenda page is also a recommendation from the Committee as well as reviewing the Terms of Reference every three years. The Committee felt that those changes would lead to better transparency than an open meeting which might stifle conversation and free dialogue. Like SCAPA, the Committee felt it to be redundant to have SCUP open when all the significant issues move on to Senate.

It was moved by H. Orbach-Miller, seconded by C. Hardy,

That the motion be amended as follows:

That meetings of Senate's standing committees and subcommittees remain closed, *with the exception of the Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Awards, the Senate Committee on University Planning and the Operations/Agenda Committee which will be open to all voting members of Senate to attend as observers.*

- a. *The aforementioned committees will be permitted to conduct meetings "in camera":*
  - (i) *when matters highly confidential to the University are being considered,*
  - (ii) *when matters of a personal nature concerning an individual are being discussed.*

- b. *Portions of the aforementioned committee's meetings that do not meet the criteria of section a) shall remain open.*
- c. *In the extraordinary instance that a portion of an aforementioned committee's meeting is closed, justification shall be given to Senate.*

The Chair ruled points a, b, and c out of order because under Senate's rules, OAC's terms of reference include reviewing the role and operation of Standing Committees. Should it be determined that meetings were to be open, the appropriate process would be to have OAC develop the rules under which open meetings would be conducted and bring forward their recommendations to Senate for debate and final decision.

There was lengthy discussion of the Chair's ruling. Those who believed the detailed amendments should be permitted argued that the decision was overly bureaucratic, non-democratic, and symptomatic of the concerns raised about Senate's effectiveness in the past year and as reported to the ad hoc committee in the course of their campus-wide consultation. This was a dangerous ruling that implied that Senate could not take back authority it had divested to a committee. Surely Senate could act in exception to its own rules from time-to-time. There was also concern about the additional time that would be required for OAC to come back with guidelines for approval. That was not likely to happen until April at the earliest, at which point students, who had been among the leading proponents of the change, would be gone from campus.

Other Senators disagreed, arguing that established procedures should be followed and that governance changes should not be rushed through. Several iterations might be needed to get the process right. Important, and practical, moves are being made towards transparency, such as the pre-circulation of the Committee agenda pages, and the annotated reports that will include context for decisions and the factors considered in decision-making. Committees need to make judgments as to what should and should not be public and their judgment should be trusted.

M. Milde noted that should the amendment be approved, the Operations Agenda Committee would move as expeditiously as possible to bring a regulatory framework back to Senate for discussion and approval. He expressed concern at the distinction being drawn between Senate and its committees given that most of the members of the committees are, in fact, senators. In seeking input from the committees, Operations Agenda was cognizant of the facts that many of the senators on the committees would be aware of arguments made in Senate, and at the same were aware of the needs of their committee in getting the work done.

H. Orbach-Miller indicated that he would accept the Chair's ruling but noted that he had thought it important that the procedural matter have a full discussion. Accordingly, the amendment was revised to read:

*That meetings of Senate's standing committees and subcommittees remain closed, with the exception of the Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Awards, the Senate Committee on University Planning and the Operations/Agenda Committee.*

D. Laird said that the issue of transparency was considered by SCUP. Having more representation on the Committee, being free to speak to issues because the meeting is closed and reviewing the Committee's Terms of Reference every three years are steps towards meeting the concerns about transparency.

As the mover of the amendment, H. Orbach-Miller said that it was intended to address a fundamental issue of transparency. He argued that openness, trust, and transparency are not mutually exclusive. The goal is for Senators to be better informed about issues coming before it. He approved of the measures taken by SCUP to increase its membership, but that need not exclude the presence of observers as well. In his view, the steps being proposed by the chairs of SCAPA and SCUP were the bare minimum to improve transparency and did not go far enough toward renewal. He referred to a discussion paper (circulated at the meeting) that cited examples of other Canadian universities that had open committee meetings and were able to make it work. There was no reason Western could not do the same. He rejected the notion that Senate was not

a political body. As a student member, he had to face election by his peers to become a Senate member – clearly a political situation.

A member expressed concern about the very substantive nature of the proposed amendment. He suggested that it might be better to refer the whole thing back to the Operations Agenda Committee for further review. Speaking against referral, a member remarked that there were not sufficient diverse voices at the Operations Agenda Committee to make a difference and Senate would be having the same discussion at the next meeting.

Speaking to the issue of trust, a member noted that, as someone who had not sat on a Senate committee, he and others in the same position could not help but feel somewhat uneasy and suspicious given that there was very limited information provided about what went on in meetings. For committee members, that would undoubtedly lead to some resentment.

A member noted that, as a student, she supported the amendment and did not accept arguments that open meetings would lead to less efficient decision making. All that was being proposed was that other senators be permitted to attend as observers, with no speaking privileges. In addition, as was pointed out by the ad hoc Committee on Renewal, there are advantages to a slower more deliberate pace of governance. Opening meetings to other senators would only deepen their understanding of the issues and consequences of decisions to be made. They would also be able to have more informed discussion with their constituents.

A member noted that the debate so far has been framed as hinging on the views of the members of the committees. Consultation with those members was a good thing, but their views should not be definitive. While it was good that consultation took place, those views should not be accepted as definitive. It is hardly surprising that the current committees think that the way they are proceeding is satisfactory. However, those views do not speak to cross-campus views expressed to the ad hoc Committee on Renewal and to the extent of the discontent with Senate, its processes, and the university administration as whole. He fully supported the students in this matter.

In response, a member remarked that those comments were mistaken because they suggested that the committees were simply maintaining the status quo, which clearly from the material provided was not the case. Pre-circulation of agendas and provision of the context and gist of committee discussion at Senate were significant changes that would have impact on Senate's ability to debate and decide on issues coming before it.

The question on the amendment was called and DEFEATED.

It was moved by M. Strong, seconded by H. Orbach-Miller,

That the motion be referred back to the Operations/Agenda for further consideration.

CARRIED

In support of the motion to refer back, it was noted that while there has been excellent debate, the attendance at the meeting was quite low. There were also some other options that could be explored, such as the possibility of opening committees on a trial basis (as is being proposed for the use of a consent agenda). Further, members of Senate had only received the students' paper at the start of the meeting and it had not been before the Operations Agenda Committee when it was discussing the issue.

In response to questions about opportunities for Senators to participate in the discussion at the Operations Agenda Committee, M. Milde said that he would welcome written submissions from Senators.

S.16-258b **Posting Committee Agendas**

It was moved by M. Milde, seconded by A. Katz,

That the agenda page for standing committee meetings be posted publicly when the full agenda package is provided to members on OWL, effective with the January 2017 meeting cycle.

CARRIED

S.16-258c **Consent Agenda**

It was moved by M. Milde, seconded by D. Laird,

That a consent agenda process be piloted for the January and February 2017 meetings of Senate.

The Chair clarified that items can be removed from the consent agenda from the floor of Senate before the Chair calls for a mover and a seconder for the motion to approve or receive for information at the meeting.

The question was called and CARRIED

S.16-258d **Nominating Committee Terms of Reference**

It was moved by M. Milde, seconded by T. Carmichael,

That the terms of reference of the Nominating Committee be revised as shown in Exhibit III, Appendix 2, Annex 2.

CARRIED

S.16-258e **Nominations from the Floor of Senate**

It was moved by M. Milde, seconded by P. Bishop,

That the practice of immediately circulating a paper ballot when a slate put forward by the Nominating Committee is contested from the floor of Senate be discontinued and an electronic vote be conducted after the meeting.

CARRIED

S.16-259 **Convocation Statistics 2016**

Senate received for information the Convocation statistics for 2016 detailed in Exhibit III, Appendix 3.

**REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND AWARDS** [Exhibit IV]

S. Macfie reported that she looked into the issue of including the add/drop dates for the summer quarter (0.25) courses into the Adding and Dropping courses policy. She confirmed that the add/drop dates for the summer quarter courses are the same as those for summer half courses and this information will be included in the policy to make this clear for the students.

S.16-260 **Faculty of Health Sciences, School of Health Studies: Revisions to the Admission and Progression Requirements of the Bachelor of Health Sciences (BHS) Program**

S.16-260a **Revisions to the Admission Requirements of the BHS Program**

It was moved by S. Macfie, seconded by D. Jorgensen,

That effective September 1, 2018, the BHS program's Admission Requirements in the Faculty of Health Sciences, School of Health Studies be revised as shown in Exhibit IV, Appendix 1.

CARRIED

S.16-260b **Revisions to the Progression Requirements of the BHS Program**

It was moved by S. Macfie, seconded by D. Jorgensen,

That effective September 1, 2017 the Progression Requirements of the BHS program be revised as shown in Exhibit IV, Appendix 2.

CARRIED

S.16-261 **Renewal of the Articulation Agreement between Western University and Fanshawe College regarding the transfer of credit for students in the Business-Accounting Diploma Program**

It was moved by S. Macfie, seconded by C. Jones,

That effective September 1, 2016 Senate approve the renewal of the Articulation Agreement between Western University and Fanshawe College regarding the transfer of credit for students in the Business-Accounting Diploma Program, as shown in Exhibit IV, Appendix 3.

CARRIED

S.16-262 **Articulation Agreement between Western University, Brescia University College, King's University College, and Lambton College regarding the transfer of credit for students in the Liberal Studies Program**

It was moved by S. Macfie, seconded by G. Parraga,

That effective September 1, 2016, Senate approve and recommend to the Board for approval the Articulation Agreement between Western University, Brescia University College, King's University College, and Lambton College regarding the transfer of credit for students in the Liberal Studies Program, as shown in Exhibit IV, Appendix 4.

CARRIED

S.16-263 **New Scholarships and Awards**

SCAPA approved on behalf of the Senate, the terms of reference for the new scholarships and awards shown in Exhibit IV, Appendix 5 for recommendation to the Board of Governors through the Vice-Chancellor.

**REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING** [Exhibit V]

S.16-264 **Budget Planning Guidelines**

Senate received for information the Budget Planning Guidelines detailed in Exhibit V, Appendix 1.

Responding to a question about how students can become involved in the budgeting process, J. Deakin said that in recent years, the USC has made submissions with recommendations directly to the President and Vice-Presidents, which were considered during the planning process, in the context of overall resources. In the future, she suggested that student input concerning the budget process be channelled through the AVP (Student Experience).

**UNIVERSITY RESEARCH BOARD** [Exhibit VI]

S.16-265 **2016 Annual Report of the Vice-President (Research)**

Senate received for information the 2016 Annual Report of the Vice-President (Research), detailed in Exhibit VI, Appendix 1. J. Capone provided an overview of his report using slides provided with the agenda package.

A member asked for an update on the recommendation contained in the final report of the University Research Board Task Force Steering Committee on Support for Research in Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities at Western that smaller grants should be made available to researchers in the forms of competitive grants and support. The focus of these programs should be to support smaller budget research where there is no anticipation of external grant funding. J. Capone said that the 2016-17 budget contained a yearly allocation of \$200,000 from the \$5-million endowment to provide ongoing support for scholarship and research in the SSHRC disciplines. The first \$200,000 from this endowment will not be available until 2017-18. Therefore, in 2016-17, an additional \$200,000 one-time allocation was made available. These funds have now been directly allocated to Faculties in conjunction with Faculty Research Development Fund allocations, at their discretion to support SSHRC-related research. J. Capone said that he continues to work through the University Research Board and consult with stakeholders to develop terms of reference for this fund, and to implement the specific programs.

S.16-266 **REPORT FROM THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS** [Exhibit VII]

The Report from the Board of Governors, detailed in Exhibit VII, was received for information.

S.16-267 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Senate received for information the list of academic administrative posts approved on behalf of the Board of Governors during the month of November 2016, detailed in Exhibit VIII.

**DISCUSSION AND QUESTION PERIOD**

S.16-268 **Update on the City of London's Rapid Transit Plan**

Asked for an update on the City of London's Rapid Transit Plan, P. White, Executive Director, Government Relations & Strategic Partnerships, said that the City and the university have continued to work towards finding a solution to ensure that existing bus transit and the proposed BRT provide convenient service to campus while maximizing ridership and service efficiency, and minimizing environmental and social impacts at Western. Five route alternatives have been identified for consideration. In order to choose the best option, it will be important to understand the potential implications to all activities on campus, including academia, research and leisure. With this in mind, Western is undertaking an extensive process of analysis and consultation with

the campus community. These consultations will seek to inform the campus community about the proposed transit routes and how they impact the campus and to provide an opportunity for students, faculty, staff and alumni to voice their opinions. The meetings are planned for January 5 and 10.

S.16-269

**Faculty/Staff Ombuds Office**

Asked why Western does not have an ombuds person to assist Western staff or faculty as it does for students, J. O'Brien, Associate Vice-President (Human Resources) said that the majority of employees at the University are represented by unions or associations that provide rights regarding representation and have language in their agreements that specifically outline how the University can deal with issues and provide for a complaint process. Western has academic and administrative leaders who can facilitate dealing with issues and assist faculty and staff with workplace problems or conflicts. To clarify issues or the interpretation of policy employees can consult staff in a number of offices including the University Secretariat, Faculty Relations, Human Resources, and Internal Audit. In addition to Equity and Human Rights Services, faculty and staff can contact the HR Learning and Development team or Rehab team for assistance depending on the concern.

S.16-270

**Wording of the Land Acknowledgment in Western's Indigenous Strategic Plan**

A member asked why the wording of the Land Acknowledgement in Western's Indigenous Strategic Plan is different from CAUT's suggested wording and the City of London's proposed wording. J. Deakin said she sought input about this matter from members of the Indigenous Strategic Initiatives Committee (ISIC) and provided their comments as follows: Land acknowledgements are necessarily local and should be developed in close collaboration and partnership with surrounding Indigenous Communities. Development of the land acknowledgement in Western's Indigenous Strategic Plan, was accomplished by working with the Indigenous Strategic Initiatives Committee, Indigenous Postsecondary Education Council (IPEC – the primary body which advises on Indigenous matters applying to the University), as well as a number of Indigenous community members and education leaders. While many different versions of land acknowledgements are used (and appropriately so) in this area, the Committee developed the specific language in the land acknowledgement to be inclusive for Western's institutional context, on campus Indigenous community members, and local Indigenous communities in the region. Several other universities have land acknowledgements that differ from CAUT's (notably University of Ottawa). The importance of Western's acknowledgement, and notably its depth and the level of inclusion, comes from the strength of Western's connectedness to its local communities and all the forms they take. Several discussions about this matter occurred during the ISIC meetings and Susan Hill was instrumental in setting up the wording; she discussed the fact that territories are more colonial terms than indigenous and that the lands need not be seen to have strict borders, thus the statement needed to recognize the multiple groups of peoples who inhabited these regions.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:11 p.m.

---

A. Chakma  
Chair

---

E. Hegedues  
Associate University Secretary