

**FINAL REPORT
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SENATE REFORM
MARCH 31, 2004**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In a memorandum dated 17 February 2003, Deans and Directors urged Senate, as the University's highest decisional body in academic matters, to direct its attention towards strategic rather than operational matters. At its March 2003 meeting, Senate agreed with this view and, at a meeting held on 11 March 2003, established an ad hoc Committee to consider ways of expediting Senate business. The ad hoc Committee was asked to submit for the October 2003 Senate Meeting, a report on Senate reform, including the presentation of alternative methods for facilitating efficient consideration of requests to Senate for routine course approvals and regulation revision approvals. Senate directed that consultation be undertaken with academic councils and Senate committees that regularly submit to Senate requests for course, program and regulation revisions.

The ad hoc Committee was also asked to consider whether heads of larger departments in the Faculties of Arts and Science should be directly represented on Senate, as well as students at the Marine Institute. Membership and the terms of reference for the ad hoc Committee, which were approved at the April 2003 meeting of Senate, are appended.

The ad hoc Committee submitted an Interim Report to Senate in October 2003 and is now submitting its Final Report. In order to bring our conclusions together in a single document, we have included portions of our earlier report in this document. Part I of the report reiterates our conclusions on the consent agenda, recommends that Senate adopt it as regular procedure, and makes suggestions about the ways in which Senate might use the time freed up as a result. Part II deals with representational issues.

FINAL REPORT

I. The Business of Senate: Facilitating and Expediting Senate Business.

In considering how the business of Senate might be expedited, the ad hoc Committee reviewed first how the current process for approval of proposals works, from formulation of proposals at the academic unit level, through undergraduate studies committees and Faculty Councils, to Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, Senate Executive, and Senate. Three possibilities for dealing with Senate business were identified:

- maintain the status quo
- devolve a portion of Senate's authority to academic councils or undergraduate studies committees
- retain Senate's authority but improve organization and presentation of Senate business.

While the dissatisfaction that some senators had expressed with the status quo suggested that some change should be considered, it was the view of the ad hoc Committee that to effect that change by devolution of a portion of Senate's authority could risk compromising the general oversight that Senate has of academic matters. However, the Committee did see ways to improve efficiency without relinquishing Senate's authority, and in its Interim Report presented at the 14 October 2003 meeting of Senate, recommended the adoption of two strategies, described below, which it felt would expedite the conduct of Senate business, i.e.: (i) the adoption of a consent agenda for less substantive matters; and (ii) the adoption of a consistent format for presentation of proposals to Senate, including an Executive Summary.

(i) Consent Agenda

The implementation of a consent agenda streamlines the way business is presented to Senate without altering the approval process. Senators still have the opportunity to review all items of Senate business, and upon the request of any two Senators, an item can be moved from the consent agenda for discussion on the floor of Senate.

With a consent agenda, routine changes such as changes in course descriptions or titles and other minor changes are presented and passed under a single motion, with no discussion, presuming there are no objections. More substantive matters - proposals for new programs, any changes to the University's General Academic Regulations (Undergraduate) and substantive changes to the faculty/school regulations – are included on the regular agenda, as they appear now on the Senate agenda. Determination of items to be placed on the consent agenda is made, in the first instance, by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (in the case of undergraduate matters) and the Academic Council of the School of Graduate Studies (in the case of graduate matters), and then by the Executive Committee of Senate as it sets the agenda for Senate. If routine changes are separated from more substantive matters in submissions for calendar changes coming forward from academic units and undergraduate studies committees, this will assist in identifying items that should be placed on the consent agenda.

(ii) Consistent format for Senate submissions, including an Executive Summary

The adoption of a consistent format for presentation, including an executive summary, will help in clarifying what is actually being brought forward for approval and why a particular proposal is being brought forward, thus facilitating and expediting the approval process. The Dean/Director of an academic unit, as the Chair of Faculty Council, is responsible for ensuring that all matters coming forward for approval from a faculty/school conform to such a standard. Proposals should be streamlined as they move through the levels of approval; for example, while written confirmation is received that appropriate consultation has occurred, and with whom, detailed evidence of that consultation, such as memoranda, e-mails etc., need not be included when proposals are transmitted from SCUGS to Senate.

Such streamlining and consistency of presentation should facilitate review and approval processes. Insofar as possible, both undergraduate and graduate matters should follow common formats. It is recommended that a revised version of the existing electronic Course/Program Proposal Format developed by SCUGS in 1999 be adopted as the standard format; SCUGS and the Academic Council of the School of Graduate Studies can review and revise as appropriate.

(iii) Use of technology for facilitating and expediting Senate business

Discussions have been undertaken with Computing and Communications with respect to the possible use of technology to facilitate Senate business, and some preliminary proposals regarding possible options have been suggested. However, further investigation and discussion of both the usefulness and practicability of these options and of implementation costs needs to be done. If Senate wishes to pursue this matter further, the ad hoc Committee recommends that another Committee with more technical expertise be struck to deal with the issue.

At its October 2003 meeting Senate agreed to the ad hoc Committee's proposal that the use of a consent agenda be adopted as a pilot project for consideration of calendar changes for the remainder of the academic year to allow for a certain period of trial and error, and to provide Senate time to determine whether introducing this change is useful. The consent agenda has now been used successfully for the November 2003, December 2003, January 2004, February 2004 and March 2004 Senate meetings and the Committee recommends that it be adopted on a permanent basis.

Senate also agreed to the adoption of a consistent format for proposals to Senate, including an Executive Summary. In a memorandum dated 05 December 2003, Academic Deans and Directors, and Department Heads were advised in this regard and asked for their assistance in expediting the approval process.

Recommendation 1:

To facilitate efficient consideration of requests to Senate for routine course approvals and regulation revision approvals, it is recommended:

- (i) that Senate adopt the use of a consent agenda, as described in this Report, for less substantive matters;
- (ii) that Senate adopt the use of a consistent format, as described in this Report, for presentation of proposals to Senate, including an Executive Summary; it is recommended that the electronic Course/Program Proposal Format developed by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies be adopted as the standard format.

Facilitating and Expediting Senate Business to Allow Senate More Time to Focus on Strategic Matters

Adoption of the consent agenda has freed up considerable time for discussion of other matters. Senate must now consider what use it wishes to make of the time which is now available. One view is that Senate should direct its attention to strategic issues. If so, Senate must consider ways in which these issues can be brought forward in order to ensure effective debate and discussion. The Committee can only make suggestions. One view is that an assembly as large as Senate is only as good or effective as the committees which shape the proposals brought to the floor for discussion. At the moment, the Planning and Budget Committee has responsibility for organizing special, thematic meetings of Senate. If Senate wishes to make more effective use of its plenary sessions, then it might consider any or all of the following suggestions:

- (i) Requesting that the Committee on Committees re-examine committees of Senate in order to determine:
 - (a) whether all of its present committees are necessary.
 - (b) whether the terms of reference of all or some of its committees should be revised.
- (ii) Whether *rapporteurs* (other than the person presenting the report) should be designated to comment on major reports being presented to Senate. Were Senate to do this, rather than endorsing or attacking the report, *rapporteurs* might be asked to focus and highlight the issues which it raises.
- (iii) Whether Deans and Directors should be asked to make presentations on strategic issues (e.g. role of graduate studies; role of the University in the community; learning technologies). At present, it is common for Deans and Directors to make presentations to the Board of Regents. Such presentations might be appropriate for Senate as well.
- (iv) Senate might also consider whether specific constituencies – for example, student unions – should be asked to develop topics or issues for consideration of Senate.

In making these suggestions, the Committee is recommending that Senate experiment with procedures and devices which might improve the quality of discussion, enabling Senate to make more effective use of its time. In order to give effect to these proposals, the Committee recommends:

Recommendation 2:

That the Senate Committee on Committees be asked to review the terms of reference and necessity of each committee of Senate.

Recommendation 3:

That the Executive Committee of Senate, as part of its overall responsibility for Senate's agenda consider: the use of *rapporteurs* on major reports; asking Deans and Directors to report on strategic issues; asking constituencies such as student unions whether they wish to develop topics for Senate discussion, as well as other devices which might help focus Senate discussion.

II. The composition of Senate: Representational Issues.

The ad hoc Committee was asked to consider whether changes in Senate composition should be recommended to the Board of Regents to provide for: (i) additional *ex officio* seats for the heads of large departments in Arts and Science, and (ii) to provide for a Senate seat for a student from the Marine Institute.

(i) *Additional ex officio Seats for the heads of large departments in Arts and Science*

The ad hoc Committee was asked to consider whether the Heads of large departments in the Faculties of Arts and Science should sit on Senate as *ex officio* members, in the same way that Deans of Faculties and Directors of Schools do. The suggestion was made by Dr. John Evans, Head of the Department of Psychology in a letter to the Secretary of Senate dated May 9, 2002. Dr. Evans argued that Heads of larger departments should be represented because a) they are “outside the scope of MUNFA bargaining units and can reasonably and openly make decisions as administrators” and because b) they “lead academic units considerably larger” than the smaller schools whose directors are represented on Senate.

The Committee was not persuaded by Dr. Evans' proposal. All Heads of Departments, and not only those of larger departments, are outside the scope of MUNFA bargaining units. Heads of Departments, however, are eligible to elect Senators and to be elected as Senators. Any claim to representation on Senate would have to rest not on numbers, but rather on distinct interests which Heads feel could not be represented by the Deans of departmentalized faculties. The Committee is not aware of any. Moreover, Senate meetings are open and interested parties may attend, and - in instances where their expertise is needed, or a distinct point of view can be put forward - can be given leave to speak. In addition, Senate is already a large body which would become even larger

if this proposal were to be adopted. The Committee found no reason why larger departments, who by dint of numbers already have a greater potential voice in Senate elections, should be given special representation on Senate. It is therefore recommended that Heads of larger departments not be added as *ex-officio* members of Senate.

Recommendation 4:

That Heads of larger departments, in the Faculties of Arts and Science, not be added as *ex-officio* members of Senate.

(ii) *Senate seat for Marine Institute students*

The ad hoc Committee was also asked to consider whether “changes in Senate composition should be recommended to the Board of Regents to provide for a Senate seat for a student from the Marine Institute.”

This is an issue which should have been resolved when the Marine Institute became part of Memorial University in 1995. Since 1985, there have been (as there are now) twelve student seats on Senate mandated in the University Act. On the recommendation of Senate, the Board of Regents allocated three of these seats to the Graduate Students’ Union (GSU), seven to the Memorial University of Newfoundland Students’ Union (MUNSU) and two to the Grenfell College Students’ Union (GCSU). When the Marine Institute became part of Memorial in 1995, its Executive Director became an *ex officio* member of Senate. At the same time, Senate seats were allocated to members of its faculty in proportion to its size, relative to other Senate constituencies. Marine Institute faculty members ended up with four (now five) seats. Two of these were new seats, created in accordance with the University Act as a result of the creation of an *ex officio* seat for the Executive Director of the Marine Institute (the Act specifies that there should be two elected seats for each *ex officio* seat), but the remaining seats were drawn from the existing complement of faculty seats. However, providing representation for Marine Institute students proved to be more difficult. The University Act provides for twelve student seats and contains no provision that the number of student seats increase if new campuses or new schools or faculties are added. Dr. Wayne Ludlow, Dean of Student Affairs at that time, was asked to find a solution. At his behest, the Council of the Students Union (CSU, later MUNSU) agreed to ‘lend’ one of its seats to the Marine Institute students for a period of two years, after which a more permanent solution was to be found. The seat was ‘lent,’ or rather made available, to a Marine Institute student. After the two year-period elapsed, the arrangement was extended for a further year with the understanding that the Dean would endeavor to find a solution prior to the September 1998 meeting of Senate. Despite attempts to reach a resolution, the matter remained unresolved and at the suggestion of the Secretary of Senate, the ad hoc Committee was asked to consider the issue.

The ad hoc Committee has spent considerable time grappling with question of Marine Institute representation, trying among other things to understand a) the relationship of

the Marine Institute to the rest of the University, b) the case for Marine Institute student representation, and c) the principles on which representation had been granted to different categories of students. All are complicated.

a) The Relationship of the Marine Institute to the rest of the University

The relationship of the Marine Institute to the rest of the University is anything but clear. In some respects, the Marine Institute is a campus and clearly a part of the University. However, its faculty are not Academic Staff Members represented by MUNFA or hired under the terms of the Collective Agreement. In addition, the Marine Institute offers both diploma and degree programs. Most of its students are enrolled in the former, but a smaller percentage are enrolled in the Bachelor of Technology and Bachelor of Maritime Studies programs. Diploma programs are not considered directly by Senate, but rather by the Academic Council of the Marine Institute. Although Marine Institute diploma students have not been represented on Senate since the temporary agreement lapsed in 1997, students in Bachelor of Technology and Bachelor of Maritime Studies programs pay tuition and student fees to Memorial University, are members of MUNSU, and have been represented on Senate.

b) The case for Marine Institute student representation

The next question which the ad hoc Committee had to consider was whether there was a case for Marine Institute student representation. If we assume that the principal task of Senate is the approval of degree programs, then there is little reason why students in diploma programs given final approval by another Council should have representation in Senate. However, Senate has been moving from the direct consideration of degree programs and calendar changes toward a fuller discussion of strategic issues facing the University. These affect not only students in degree programs, but also students in diploma programs. The Committee therefore recommends that the Marine Institute Student Union (MISU) be represented on Senate.

c) The principles on which representation to student groups has been granted:

Discerning the principles on which representation of different groups of students has been granted is more difficult. Senate documents and reports, along with Senate By-laws and Procedures, Minutes, and correspondence were examined in order to understand the history and composition of Senate. Three documents proved to be important: the 1967 report of a Committee struck by President M.O. Morgan and chaired by Dr. Leslie Harris entitled The Government and Administration of Memorial University of Newfoundland, the April 1968 Report of the ad hoc Committee established by the Senate to Examine and Report on the Implementation of Certain Principles Concerning the Composition of Senate (Dr. Leslie Harris (Chairman), Dr. Hugh Whalen, Dr. George Story), and the October 21, 1968 memorandum to members of Senate from the Dean of Arts and Science (Dr. Leslie Harris), subject: "Reconstitution of the Senate - Motion to be presented at the Meeting of November 12,

1968.”

The 1968 Harris report recommended that there be one student member of Senate for every two *ex officio* members. The motion regarding the reconstitution of the Senate as outlined in Section viii of Dr. Harris’ October 21, 1968 memorandum was approved, with amendments, at the November 12, 1968 meeting of Senate, resulting in a Senate comprising 15 *ex officio* members, 30 elected members, and 8 student representatives. Although these numbers reflected the ratio recommended in the 1968 report, a fixed number of seats, rather than a ratio of student seats to *ex officio* (and thus to faculty) seats, was entrenched in the University Act. Thus, while the numbers of *ex officio* and faculty seats grew as new schools and faculties were added, the number of student seats was fixed. Students at Sir Wilfred Grenfell College were assigned one of the existing eight student seats in 1976, at the same time as the Western Regional College was designated a constituency of Senate.

In December 1985, the Board of Regents, on the recommendation of Senate, passed a resolution that Section 56 c) of the Memorial University Act be amended to increase the student membership on Senate from eight to twelve. Senate was advised in a memorandum from the Board of Regents dated February 10, 1987, that the Act had been amended as proposed. Subsequently the additional seats were allocated as follows: Council of the Students’ Union, St. John’s campus - two, Council of the Students’ Union, Sir Wilfred Grenfell College - one, Graduate Students Union - one (Senate Minutes March 10, 1987). It is difficult to discern the principles on which the new seats were allocated. Rather than considering the total numbers of students on each campus, the new seats appear to have been allocated in proportion to the relative size of the three units involved. The two smaller units, Grenfell and graduate students each received one additional seat, while undergraduate students on the St. John’s campus received two of the four new seats. This brought the number of undergraduate student Senators to nine, of which seven were allocated to the CSU and its successor, MUNSU, and two to SWGC. GSU seats increased from two to three.

Representing Marine Institute Students:

Once the ad hoc Committee had agreed that Marine Institute students should be represented, the question of how this was to be achieved remained. The Committee (and Senate and ultimately the Board of Regents) faced a choice of recommending that additional students seats be established, or alternatively, recommending that the existing twelve student seats be redistributed so that Marine Institute students could be represented along with students from other campuses or constituencies. We have opted for the latter, and recommend that the nine undergraduate seats be redistributed according to the relative size of their student enrollment. If the Committee’s recommendations as given below are followed, MUNSU will retain its seven of the nine student seats, Sir Wilfred Grenfell Students Union (SWGC) will drop from two seats to one, and the Marine Institute Student Union (MISU) will be allocated one seat. However, the Committee is also recommending that the ratio of student to *ex officio*

seats originally proposed in the 1968 Harris report, be adopted, and when possible, incorporated into the University Act. This would ensure that new student seats would be created should the number of schools, faculties, and campuses, and thus the number of *ex officio* seats, increase.

There are a number of reasons why the Committee is recommending this solution. First, Senate is already a large body which finds it difficult to deliberate effectively in the quarters available to it. The Committee is reluctant to recommend further enlargement unless the addition of new schools, faculties or campuses requires it. Further, there are already twelve student representatives in Senate, or approximately one student representative for each two *ex officio* members (23) and every four elected representatives (46). In the Committee's view, this provides for more than adequate representation in a body in which voice and persuasive argument are generally more important than numbers. At present, three of the twelve seats are allocated to the Graduate Student Union. The Committee recommends that this number be retained, both because graduate students are a distinct constituency with distinct interests and concerns (e.g. funding) and because the number of graduate students (currently 2015) is expected to grow over the next few years.

If MISU representation is to be drawn from the existing nine undergraduate seats on Senate, the question remains of how this is to be done. One possibility would be to take a seat from MUNSU, as the largest unit represented. This would be in keeping with the way in which new student seats were distributed in 1985 but would violate the principle of proportionality. At present, there are approximately 14,000 undergraduates on the St. John's campus, 1100 at Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, and 1200 students at the Marine Institute (including students enrolled in degree programs such as Bachelor of Maritime Studies and Bachelor of Technology as well as students enrolled in diploma and certificate programs and programs specifically designed in response to demand from the industrial sector). The principle being suggested is in fact identical to that used to redistribute faculty seats among Senate's constituencies: each faculty or school, regardless of size, has a minimum of one seat. However, other seats are reallocated annually by the Senate Committee on Elections as the relative size of faculty complements, and thus constituencies, changes.

Before making this recommendation to Senate, the Committee wanted to discuss this with representatives of the four student unions. Because at least one was located at some distance, it proved difficult to arrange a meeting, but one did take place in February, 2004. As might be expected, representatives of the student unions were not pleased with the proposed reallocation and suggested alternate solutions. One possibility suggested was rotation of one seat among the three unions. MUNSU instead devised an alternate proposal, through which one of its seven seats would be lent to the Marine Institute students for a three year period, after which the issue would be reconsidered. This was a very generous offer, but one which the Committee cannot recommend. There are several reasons for this. First, having reached the conclusion that MISU students should have representation, we can see no good reason for either

denying a seat to them or forcing them to obtain it through the ‘loan’ of seat from another student union. This would not be fair to Marine Institute students. Second, although it has been the practice to consult students, the allocation of student seats is not determined by MUNSU or the student unions, collectively, or even Senate, but rather by the Board of Regents on recommendation of Senate. Third, the Committee sees little reason to postpone a more permanent resolution of this issue, which was dormant for several years. Doing so would mean that the considerable work which we have done would have to be repeated by another committee. In that a solution is at hand, postponing would not be a good use of faculty, staff, or students’ time.

In proposing this solution, the Committee is recommending not only redistribution of student seats, but also the re-establishment of a principle articulated nearly forty years ago, but somehow lost as the university grew: that the number of student seats on Senate be in ratio to the number of *ex officio* and thus faculty seats on Senate. The ratio proposed in the 1967 report was one student seat for every two *ex officio* seats. At the moment there are twenty three *ex officio* seats, and twelve student seats. We recommend that the Board of Regents request that this be entrenched in the University Act at the next available opportunity.

Recommendation 5:

- (i) That a permanent Senate seat be allocated to Marine Institute students from within existing student seats.
- (ii) That the seat to be re-allocated be from the nine undergraduate seats.
- (iii) That based on student enrollment, the undergraduate seat to be re-allocated to Marine Institute students be from Sir Wilfred Grenfell College.

Recommendation 6:

That a principle for determining student representation on Senate be established and enshrined in the Memorial University Act. In keeping with the principle of allocating elected Senate seats in proportion to the number of *ex-officio* seats, we recommend that the Board of Regents request that the Memorial University Act be amended, at the next opportunity, to change student representation on Senate from the fixed number of twelve, by bringing Section 54(d) of the Act in line with Sections 54(b) (x) and 54 (c).

The proposed amendment to the Act would then read:

“54(d) members from the students in attendance at the University to be chosen in a number and manner that may be approved by the Board, but the number chosen under this paragraph shall not be less than half the number of members named or chosen under paragraph (b).”

This completes the work of this committee, but not in our view, the process of Senate Reform, which should continue as Senate experiments with new devices for focusing and sharpening its discussion of issues of importance to the Memorial University community. Needed for this to continue is not a committee but rather imagination and good will.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

To facilitate efficient consideration of requests to Senate for routine course approvals and regulation revision approvals.

- (i) That Senate adopt the use of a consent agenda, as described in this Report, for less substantive matters.
- (ii) That Senate adopt the use of a consistent format, as described in this Report, for presentation of proposals to Senate, including an Executive Summary; it is recommended that the electronic Course/Program Proposal Format developed by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies be adopted as the standard format.

Recommendation 2:

That the Senate Committee on Committees be asked to review the terms of reference and necessity of each committee of Senate.

Recommendation 3:

That the Executive Committee of Senate, as part of its overall responsibility for Senate's agenda consider: the use of *rapporteurs* on major reports; asking Deans and Directors to report on strategic issues; asking constituencies such as student unions whether they wish to develop topics for Senate discussion, as well as other devices which might help focus Senate discussion.

Recommendation 4:

That Heads of larger departments, such as the Faculty of Arts and Science, not be added as *ex-officio* members of Senate.

Recommendation 5:

- (i) That a permanent Senate seat be allocated to Marine Institute students from within existing student seats.
- (ii) That the seat to be re-allocated be from the nine undergraduate seats.
- (iii) That based on student enrollment, the undergraduate seat to be re-allocated to Marine Institute students be from Sir Wilfred Grenfell College.

Recommendation 6:

That a principle for determining student representation on Senate be established and enshrined in the Memorial University Act. In keeping with the principle of allocating elected Senate seats in proportion to the number of *ex-officio* seats, we recommend that the Board of Regents request that the Memorial University Act be amended, at the next opportunity, to change student representation on Senate from the fixed number of twelve, by bringing Section 54(d) of the Act in line with Sections 54(b) (x) and 54 (c).

The proposed amendment to the Act would then read:

“54(d) members from the students in attendance at the University to be chosen in a number and manner that may be approved by the Board, but the number chosen under this paragraph shall not be less than half the number of members named or chosen under paragraph (b).”

AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON SENATE REFORM

Preamble

The Committee shall examine questions raised in the memorandum of March 12, 2002 related to a request by the Deans and Directors concerning Senate Reform. Additionally, the Committee shall review the composition of Senate with respect to the representation on Senate for students at the Marine Institute and certain department heads. Background information related to these issues is attached.

Membership

- (a) Secretary of Senate
- (b) One undergraduate student to be recommended by MUNSU
- (c) One graduate student to be recommended by the GSU
- (d) A representative of the Deans and Directors
- (e) Seven (7) academic staff members, including 4 Senators, a representative from Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, a representative from the Marine Institute, and a representative from the Faculty of Medicine

Terms of Reference

Consistent with the composition, duties, and powers of the Senate and the duties and powers of the Board of Regents as defined by the Memorial University Act, the ad hoc Committee is charged with the following responsibilities:

- a) To consider procedures that will facilitate more efficient consideration of requests to Senate for routine course approvals and regulation revision approvals.
- b) To consult with Senate Committees and/or Academic Councils that regularly submit requests for course or regulation approvals to Senate and to consider the recommendations coming from these bodies.
- c) To consult with faculty and academic councils and to consider the recommendations coming from these councils.
- d) To consult with administrative units (e.g. Registrar's Office) that are involved in the implementation of decisions related to course or regulation changes and to consider the recommendations coming from these units.
- e) To consult with administrative units (e.g. Computing and Communications) that may be able to provide advice regarding appropriate technology that may be employed to improve the efficiency of considering routine approval requests and to consider the recommendations coming from these units.

- f) To consider whether changes in Senate composition should be recommended to the Board of Regents to provide for additional ex-officio Senate seats for the Heads of large departments in the Faculties of Arts and Science.
- g) To consider whether changes in Senate composition should be recommended to the Board of Regents to provide for a Senate seat for a student from the Marine Institute.
- h) To examine and make recommendations on any other matter deemed by the Ad-hoc Committee to be relevant to its principal task.
- i) To present a report on Senate Reform, including the presentation of alternative procedures for improving the efficiency of routine requests for Senate approval, to Senate at the October 2003 meeting.

Membership:

Dr. Steve Wolinetz (Political Science, Senator), Chair
Mr. Jamie Baker (Graduate Students' Union)
Dr. Glyn George (Faculty of Engineering)
Dr. Tom Gordon (Dean/Director Representative)
Dr. June Harris (Faculty of Medicine)
Mr. Brian Kerr (Marine Institute)
Professor Vivienne Kuester (Human Kinetics and Recreation, Senator)
Mrs. Maire O'Dea (Acting University Registrar)
Ms. Claudia Powell (Memorial University of Newfoundland Students' Union)
(replaced by Jessica Magalios)
Dr. Dennis Treslan (Faculty of Education, Senator) - Resigned
Dr. Paul Wilson (Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, Senator)