

**Senate Operations Review Committee
Motion
May 28, 2013**

1. Establish the Senate Governance and Nominating Committee

Rationale:

The Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC) has reviewed its role and that of the Senate Nominating Committee and found that there is a direct synergy between the two committees. As it is currently the role of SORC to advise on operations and structures, it is a natural extension of that role to also contribute to the staffing of all standing committees of Senate. Currently the Board of Trustees has a Governance and Nominating Committee which performs the same role as prescribed below with great effectiveness and provides a successful model for Senate to build upon. The model is also found in other Senates within Canada. SORC met with the Chair of the Nominating Committee to seek his opinion on the merging of the committees, and he felt that it was appropriate. The Nominating Committee has also endorsed the recommendation.

Draft Terms of Reference:

**Senate Governance and Nominating Committee
Terms of Reference and Membership**

Mandate

The Senate Governance and Nominating Committee advises Senate on the efficiency and effectiveness of governance structures and its composition and membership. It also advises on the composition and membership of Senate standing committees and nominates Senate representatives for appointment to internal and external bodies.

The Governance and Nominating Committee shall:

1. advise Senate on operations, efficient and effective structures supporting good governance and appropriate linkages between Senate, Faculty Boards and other parts of the internal governance structure which operate with delegated authority regarding matters of academic policy.
2. review and monitor the membership needs of the Senate and its standing and *ad hoc* committees and to solicit, receive and review names of potential members and recommend members for appointment to such committees by Senate.
3. advise Senate on the appointment of Senate representatives to bodies external to Senate and their committees.
4. advise Senate on the establishment, terms of reference, composition, membership and retirement of its standing and *ad hoc* committees and their respective sub-committees.
5. monitor and report to Senate on the effective operation of the Senate's standing and *ad hoc* committees and their sub-committees.

Composition

Elected:

4 faculty Senators (one of whom shall be Chair of the Committee)

1 Dean

1 undergraduate student Senator
1 graduate student Senator
1 staff Senator

Ex-officio:
Chair of Senate

Support:
University Secretary (advising, non-voting)
Associate Secretary (Senate) (secretary, non-voting)

Motion:

That Senate establish the Senate Governance and Nominating Committee effective September 1, 2013 and that the Senate Operations Review Committee and the Senate Nominating Committee be dissolved effective August 31, 2013.

2. Establish the Senate Agenda and Summer Advisory Committee

Rationale:

At the request of the Chair of Senate, the Senate Operations Review Committee was asked to consider charging a standing committee of Senate with formal responsibility to advise the Principal regarding matters of academic import when Senate is not in session. It was determined that the Senate Agenda Committee would be most conversant with matters appropriate to Senate and therefore the mandate could be enhanced and the composition diversified and enlarged to provide this on-going support to the Chair of Senate. This proposal would not endow this Committee with any greater authority than currently exists. Specifically, this committee will not be empowered to act on behalf of Senate

Draft Terms of Reference:

Senate Agenda and Summer Advisory Committee Terms of Reference and Membership

Terms of Reference

1. Approve the agenda for each meeting of the Senate.
2. Determine the items for the Open and Closed Agendas of Senate.
3. Consider and take action on behalf of the Senate by referring to the appropriate Senate Committee or Senate all matters that may be directed to Senate.
4. Provide advice on matters of an academic character to the Chair of Senate during the Spring/Summer term when Senate is not in session.

Composition

Ex-Officio

Chair of Senate (who will be Chair of the Committee)

Vice-Chair of Senate (Vice-chair of the Committee)

Elected:

1 Dean

3 faculty Senators

1 undergraduate student Senator

1 graduate student Senator

1 staff Senator

Support:

University Secretary (advising, non-voting)

Associate Secretary (Senate) (secretary, non-voting)

Agenda Consideration Guidelines

The objective of the Agenda and Summer Advisory Committee is to ensure that items falling under the business of Senate, as determined Rules of Procedure of Senate, reach the agenda in a timely and appropriate manner. The following guidelines will be followed in its consideration of potential agenda items.

1. The Agenda Committee shall draw up the Agenda for the Senate meetings from items submitted to the Secretary and shall arrange that all business that goes forward to the Senate is in properly prepared form.

If it is the decision of the Agenda and Summer Advisory Committee that an item falls under the jurisdiction of Senate and the item is in the proper form for transmission to Senate, the Committee may require that additional documentation be provided as a condition of the item going forward on a Senate agenda.

Summer Advisory

2. To advise the Chair of Senate regarding matters of an academic character when Senate is not in session during the Spring/Summer term. Items agreed upon, or advice given during this period will be reported to Senate at its first meeting of the new session.

Motion:

That the Senate Agenda Committee be retitled the Senate Agenda and Summer Advisory Committee and that the committee mandate be revised as recommended effective September 1, 2013.

3. Senate Information Technology Committee

Upon receipt of a report (attached) from the Senate Information Technology Committee, on April 19, 2013 the Senate Operations Review Committee considered the following recommendations:

- 1) We recommend that the Senate not continue with the SITC in its current form as the committee lacks a relevant mandate and the value offered by the committee to the Queen's community is unclear.

- 2) We recommend that Senate determine whether it has a need for a Senate committee related to information technology.
 - a. If Senate determines that there is a need for such a committee, we recommend that Senate work with the committee to establish a clear mandate and membership structure to better align the committee to Senate's mandate.
 - b. If Senate decides that there is no need for such a committee, we recommend that Senate consider the risks associated with dissolving the committee and how best to ensure that issues related to information technology are aligned to Senate.

It was determined that in order to evaluate the flow of information and to ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place to address the Committee's concern noted in item d) of the report:

“One potential loss we can see in the demise of the Committee is the opportunity for students, staff and especially faculty to be informed of IT plans and priorities and provide input to the AVP-IT/CIO on matters relating to IT. This is the rationale behind our recommendation that Senate consider how it has IT represented. If Senate supports the idea, an IT presence at Senate could potentially be more effective than a separate committee.”

it would be prudent to not continue with the Committee in its current structure, as suggested by the IT Committee, but rather take a pause to study the issue in greater depth. Given the concern articulated above, a mechanism should be established to ensure faculty input and awareness of IT initiatives that have academic impacts. As noted in the report from the SITC, such a mechanism has been established for students. SORC is recommending that a similar mechanism be developed for faculty. SORC will undertake an evaluation of the effectiveness of the mechanism while SITC is on hiatus and undertakes to report back to Senate in April of 2014 regarding this issue.

The Senate Operations Review Committee therefore is recommending the following action to Senate:

Motion:

That the Senate Information Technology Committee be placed on hiatus for one year (2013/2014) pending a review of the recommendations contained in the committee report attached as Appendix A and that Senate recommend to the Chief Information Officer that a Faculty Advisory Committee within the Information Technology Services administrative committee structure be established.

Recommendations to the Senate Operations Review Committee Regarding

The Requirement for the Senate Information Technology Committee

Members of the Senate Information Technology Committee (SITC) have devoted several meetings to discussing whether our Committee has a relevant mandate and is providing value for the Queen's community. We offer the following recommendations to the Senate Operations Review Committee. Below, we expand briefly on our rationale for arriving at these recommendations.

Recommendations

- 1) We recommend that the Senate not continue with the SITC in its current form as the committee lacks a relevant mandate and the value offered by the committee to the Queen's community is unclear.

- 2) We recommend that Senate determine whether it has a need for a Senate committee related to information technology.
 - a. If Senate determines that there is a need for such a committee, we recommend that Senate work with the committee to establish a clear mandate and membership structure to better align the committee to Senate's mandate.
 - b. If Senate decides that there is no need for such a committee, we recommend that Senate consider the risks associated with dissolving the committee and how best to ensure that issues related to information technology are aligned to Senate.

Rationale

Our rationale revolves around several recurring themes which emerged during our discussions regarding the Committee:

- A) The Committee was established by Senate in the 1970's. Since then, to our knowledge, Senate has never referred any matter to SITC to consider, other than reviewing our mandate on several occasions.

- B) The Committee has never seemed to have a strong link to Senate, and at times has functioned without a Senator as a member.

- C) Since the Committee was established, the University has developed a comprehensive governance framework for information technology matters, with structures to enable

decision-making and input from stakeholders. For example, the recently established [Information Services and Technologies Student Advisory Committee](#) and [Enterprise Information Technology Advisory Committee](#) now ensure that students and IT leaders and managers from all faculties have a forum to raise issues, influence priorities and provide input and direction to IT planning. The need for this Committee is greatly diminished with this governance framework in place. It is unclear if there is a requirement for a separate additional forum for faculty to have input.

- D) One potential loss we can see in the demise of the Committee is the opportunity for students, staff and especially faculty to be informed of IT plans and priorities and provide input to the AVP-IT/CIO on matters relating to IT. This is the rationale behind our recommendation that Senate consider how it has IT represented. If Senate supports the idea, an IT presence at Senate could potentially be more effective than a separate committee.

We believe it is Senate's responsibility to decide on the future of the Senate IT Committee, and we respectfully submit these recommendations for consideration by the Senate Operations Review Committee and Senate.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Michael Vandenburg". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Michael Vandenburg, Chair – Senate Information Technology Committee