

## MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

### SENATE

The regular meeting of Senate was held on December 12, 2023 at 4:00 p.m. NDT via Webex.

#### 152. PRESENT

Dr. N. Bose – Chair	Dr. G. George	Dr. P. Osmond-Johnson
Dr. J. Lokash – Deputy Chair	Mr. N Gillingham	Dr. D. Peters
Mr. E. Ludlow – Chancellor	Dr. S. Giwa	Dr. A. Pike
Mr. M. Alam	Dr. M. Haghiri	Dr. J. Pridham
Dr. T. Allen	Dr. E. Haven	Dr. P. Ride
Dr. J. Anderson	Dr. N. Hurley	Dr. S. Rowe
Dr. F. Bambico	Dr. P. Issahaku	Mr. S. Sayeedi
Ms. H. Bello	Dr. K. Jacobsen	Mr. S. Shah
Dr. E. Bezzina	Dr. D. Keeping	Dr. S. Shetranjiwalla
Dr. P. Brett	Dr. E. Kendall	Ms. B. Simmons
Ms. M. Broders	Mr. N. Keough	Dr. K. Simonsen
Dr. T. Brown	Dr. C. Kozak	Dr. J. Sinclair
Dr. K. Bulmer	Dr. K. Laing	Ms. B. Smith
Dr. R. Burry	Dr. M. Marshall	Dr. M. Stordy
Dr. T. Chapman	Dr. D. McKeen	Dr. I. Sutherland
Mr. J. Chowdhury	Dr. L.A. McKivor	Dr. K. Szego
Mr. C. Couturier	Dr. L. Moores	Ms. C. Walsh
Dr. D. Hardy-Cox	Dr. D. Mullings	Dr. A. Warren
Dr. A. Cunsolo	Dr. K. Myrick	Mr. R. Waye
Dr. P. Dold	Dr. S. Neilsen	Dr. J. Westcott
Dr. E. Fraser	Ms. T. Noseworthy	Dr. M. Woods

#### PRESENT BY INVITATION

Dr. S. Sullivan, Chair, Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

#### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Mr. S. Abyaz	Dr. D. Hancock	Dr. P. Morrill
Dr. K. Anderson	Mr. J. Harris	Ms. H. Pretty
Dr. A. Bittner	Dr. T. Hennessey	Dr. C. Purchase
Dr. S. Bugden	Dr. K. Hodgkinson	Dr. K. Shannahan
Dr. P. Button	Dr. D. Kelly	Dr. AM. Sullivan
Dr. O. Dobre	Dr. A. Loucks-Atkinson	Mr. P. Sullivan
Dr. E. Durnford	Dr. S. MacDonald	Dr. L. Twells
Dr. T. Fridgen	Dr. S. Moore	Mr. S. Yadav

153. MOTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA

It was moved by Dr. G. George and seconded by Dr. I Sutherland, and carried to adopt the agenda as presented, with no oppositions and no abstentions.

154. MINUTES

It was moved by Dr. C Couturier and seconded by Dr. P. Brett and carried that the minutes from the Regular Senate meeting on November 14, 2023, be taken and read as confirmed with some minor amendments, with no oppositions and no abstentions.

It was moved by Dr. J. Lokash and seconded by Dr. M. Woods and carried that the minutes from the Special Senate meeting on November 14, 2023, be taken and read as confirmed, with no oppositions and no abstentions.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

It was moved by Dr. G. George seconded by Dr. M. Haghiri and carried that the consent agenda be approved as presented, with a minor correction:

**under** 5.2 Master of Science in Nursing – Calendar Revisions “...the number of clinical hours to be increased from 728 to 736 to ~~728~~ in the MScN program, and requests changes...”

The motion carried. One member abstained and no members opposed.

155. **Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Studies:**

4.1 Calendar Changes – Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science

The Faculty proposed:

- Amending the Spring Academic Term 7 and Winter Academic Term 8 rows in the table found in Faculty’s 6.1 Civil Engineering Program Regulations.
- Adding the requirement of twelve 1-hour tutorials per semester to the course CIV 6120 Hydraulics.
- A new course: ENGI 1050 Electric Circuits; deleting the course ENGI 1040 Mechanisms and Electric Circuits; and associated secondary changes.

156. **Report of The Academic Council, School of Graduate Studies**

5.1 Faculty of Science – Calendar Revisions:

The Faculty of Science is requesting approval of revisions to section 31.5.2, 31.5.3, and 43.3.2 of the University Calendar. The Faculty of Science is requesting approval of calendar changes with respect to the frequency of Supervisory Committee members and requests the removal of the requirement for students to be solely

responsible for scheduling committee meetings. In addition, the Faculty of Science requests calendar changes to courses BIOC 6590 and BIOC 6999.

5.2 Master of Science in Nursing – Calendar Revisions:

The Faculty of Nursing is requesting approval of revisions to section 40.4, 40.6 of the calendar and 10 new graduate courses to replace courses from previous curriculum in the MScN program. The Faculty of Nursing also requests the number of clinical hours to be increased from 736 to 728 in the MScN program, and requests changes to the number of credit hours (to be decreased slightly). The impetus for these changes was the release of new entry-level pan Canadian Nurse Practitioner competencies by the Canadian Council of Registered Nurse Regulators.

5.3 The School of Human Kinetics and Recreation (HKR) is requesting approval of revisions to section 24 and 36 of the University Calendar and removal of section 23:

The School of HKR is requesting the removal of the Master of Human Kinetics and Recreation (MHKR thesis Route) program and to replace it with a Master of Science in Human Kinetics and Recreation (MSc (HKR)). The School of HKR is also requesting to rename the Master of Science in Kinesiology to the Master of Science in Human Kinetics and Recreation, which allows for only one thesis route option. They request to make related calendar changes with respect to this program. The School of HKR is also requesting minor revisions to existing course titles, as well as minor revisions to the language related to HKR 6314. They are requesting to remove course names that are no longer offered for the MHKR course-route, and to add courses that will be offered in the MSc (HKR) thesis-based program, include minor changes to the language on the requirements for the MSc (HKR) and MHKR programs, and include changes to the application deadline in the calendar from April 1<sup>st</sup> to February 1<sup>st</sup> to allow for the admission processes to begin and conclude more efficiently.

6.0 Senate Committee on Course Evaluation

- 6.1 Annual Report.
- 6.2 Terms of Reference.

7.0 Senate Committee on Research

- 7.1 Annual Report.
- 7.2 Terms of Reference.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

The Chair invited Ms. C. Walsh, Senator and Chair of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning, to present this item.

8.0 Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning

- 8.1 Annual Report.

Ms. Walsh gave a brief outline of the annual report as outlined in the supporting documentation. The motion that Senate approve the SCTL annual report was seconded by C. Couturier; carried with no members opposed or abstained.

## 8.2 Terms of Reference.

Ms. Walsh noted that changes stemming from the updated policies and procedures document, as well as recommendations from the ECTE report, necessitated revisions to the SCCE's Terms of Reference, including a proposed change of name for the Committee (Senate Committee on Course Experience). A copy of the updated Terms of Reference, with proposed revisions noted in mark-up (tracked changes), is included in Appendix B.

Ms. Walsh advised that the document "Student Rating of Courses and Instruction Administrative Policies and Procedures" requires substantial revision to reflect the new purpose statement (approved by Senate in December 2019), the Evaluating Course and Teaching Effectiveness (ECTE) report (approved by Senate in October 2021), and the redeveloped Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) system (detailed in the current report). It was decided that the Policies and Procedures document should be divided into two sections, one for policy and the other for procedures, to align with other Memorial policy documents. The SCCE working group revised this document in stages over the duration of the system implementation and pilot semester in the 2022-2023 academic year.

The Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) has been paused since December 2019, and the CEQ would be implemented through a new system. The Policies and Procedures document has been revised in light of the new purpose statement – the recommendations coming out of the ECTC over the last year or so. A copy of the updated policies and procedures document is included in Appendix A, both as a marked-up (tracked changes) version from the last Senate approved version (April 2020) and as a clean copy with mark-up accepted.

### **Questions from the Floor**

Dr. Kendall questioned section 2.5 of the Senate Policies and Procedures for Student Feedback on Course Experience (Revised December 2023) regarding exclusions from the CEQ, it specifically identifies the Faculty of Medicine being excluded. Was it also intended under A 10 (a) to (c) to exclude the Faculty of Medicine?

Ms. Walsh noted she would confirm that the courses outside of the modularized Faculty of Medicine courses are included in the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ). She would follow up. She advised that the SCCE have been in conversation with the Faculty of Medicine, over the years, as this process has proceeded and understand that they do have a separated administrative delivery system – to deliver their unique course feedback opportunities within the Faculty of Medicine program.

Dr. Kendall noted that as most of the teaching activities in 2.2.2 and 2.2.4 the Faculty of Medicine would be excluded, why was the Faculty of Medicine specifically named. Any unit within 2.2.2 to 2.2.4 would be excluded but the Faculty of Medicine was specifically

named. He suggested an edit - to strike the words Faculty of Medicine and then let the other processes that are detailed in 2.2.2 to 2.2.4 exclude the medical things.

Ms. Walsh recognized that there are additional procedural pieces that are yet to be developed. A follow up conversation with the Faculty of Medicine generally to revise that exception, 2.2.5, and either consider an amendment to the Policies and Procedures document at this point, or revisit it in a subsequent submission, in the next round of revisions to the Policies and Procedures which would be submitted at a later date. Dr. Kendall agreed to submit the changes at a later date.

Dr. E. Bezzina asked if the evaluations would be available to students who might want to take the course in the future (5.3.1)

Ms. Walsh asked if Dr. Bezzina was asking whether or not there is publication of the CEQ results? She advised that publication of results was terminated in a April 2020 Senate meeting. She noted that publication of results is never going to be a “thing” with any of this summary data that comes from the CEQ.

Dr. Bezzina asked about the extent of union input into the revised procedures and evaluation system.

Ms. Walsh advised that the special Committee of Senate on the ECTE had representation from all of the teaching unions. They were part of the recommendations in the report. The report and recommendations were discussed and approved in the October 2021 Senate meeting. These procedures and policies have resulted from that report which has led to the development of the revisions of the policies and procedures. You will note several times in the track changes portion, that there is a lot of reference to a line with the Evaluating Course and Teaching Effectiveness (ECTC) recommendations and report. While there was no direct input from union representatives into the revision of that document, there was a continued referral back to the guiding documents – the 2019 approved purpose statement and the 2021 approved ECTC report.

Dr. Bezzina asked if there was a reason why the results are not being made available to students?

Ms. Walsh advised that there was quite a lot of concern expressed by various groups. These forms may be useful to instructors in terms of revising their teaching practices. It was decided that they should not be available to students to make decisions about which course or instructor they should or should not be using. The ECTE report is the premise behind the entire review stemming from that report back in 2021.

Dr. E. Fraser noted that we are using these CEQs now and many faculty are expressing disappointment around the limitations of the supplementary questions that can be added. She noted that it was possible to add your own questions to the CEQs but not anything you want. It is quite restrained – there are example questions that you can choose but if those are not what you want, there is no option to put in your own questions. What was the rationale?

Ms. Walsh advised that there has been quite a lot of work done to implement the new CEQs in the new technological solution called Blue by Explorance. Apparently, some of the features are tentative to be rolled out, have been rolled out, and will roll out in a

staggered approach. The very first edit of the CEQs was in the Spring Semester and there were only 2 questions that instructors could choose from to add to their supplementary questions. This Fall Semester, there was a pre-selection of about 25 questions that instructors could choose from to add or customize their particular CEQs. A process will roll out in the Winter Semester aiming for feedback from instructors across all campuses regarding the additional questions faculty would like to see added to the CEQs. Expect to see much more of what you were are hoping to see in the Winter Semester roll out of the CEQs.

Dr. P. Osmond-Johnston asked for clarity that Deans only receive an aggregated report across the unit and no longer receive the individual CEQs and if it applies to sessional instructors or just to full-time faculty.

Ms. Walsh replied that every course that is a mandated course will have a CEQs tagged to it – courses that belong to a unit would receive reports based on their own courses or the units own subject codes as aggregated reports. There is no feedback on the CEQs on an individual level.

Dr. L. Moores asked in the expanded roll out of features, is developing one's own questions an option as opposed to choosing between preset options?

Ms. Walsh advised that question sets will be pre-established. When SCCE reaches out to faculty and you have particular types of questions that you would like to have included – you could participate in the opportunity to get those different questions added to the options or selection. She advised that she would follow up as to whether or not if there are potential options for adding questions of your own.

The motion that Senate approve the revisions to the document “Student Rating of Courses and Instruction Administrative Policies and Procedures” as outlined in item 8.2, including the new title “Senate Policies and Procedures for Student Feedback on Course Experience”.

The motion was moved by Dr. Giwa and second by Dr. Brett; the motion was carried. No members opposed or abstained.

Dr. Walsh advised of the updates to the Terms of Reference. Noted Changes stemming from the updated policies and procedures document, as well as recommendations from the ECTE report, necessitated revisions to the SCCE's Terms of Reference, including a proposed change of name for the Committee (Senate Committee on Course Experience). A copy of the updated Terms of Reference, with proposed revisions noted in mark-up (tracked changes), is included in Appendix B.

The motion that Senate approve the revisions to the SCCE Terms of Reference as outline in item 8.2, moved by Dr. S Giwa and seconded by Dr. P. Brett; the motion was carried. No members opposed or abstained.

The Chair invited Dr. L. McKivor to present this item.

#### 9.0 Senate Committee on Elections, Committees and By-Laws (SCECB):

- 9.1 Recommendation to approve part of the membership for the ad-hoc committee regarding “Ode to Newfoundland” (Ode) during the University’s convocation ceremonies; “5 elected academic staff members appointed from among eligible Senators”.

The SCECB received 7 nominations; 2 two of the nominations received were from individuals who are not part of Senate, so they were not considered and the remaining 5 nominations listed below for Senate’s consideration:

- Edwin Bezzina
- Cyr Couturier
- Craig Purchase
- Kati Szego
- Michael Woods

Dr. McKivor advised that the student membership to the committee is currently being considered through a process organized by Memorial’s student unions’. Individual names would be presented to senate for information in January 2024. Also, Dr. McKivor will be contacting committee members in the coming weeks to give them an opportunity to ask questions, to clarify the positions they have been nominated into and the students are fine with this. A meeting with the students would be arranged as soon as their nominations have been confirmed.

The motion that Senate approve the academic staff members indicated in Item 9.1. for membership for the ad-hoc committee regarding “Ode to Newfoundland” (Ode) during the university’s convocation ceremonies.

The motion was moved by Dr. G. George and seconded by Dr. M. Haghiri; the motion was carried. No members opposed or abstained.

- 9.2 Nomination to Senate – School of Pharmacy – Dr. John Hawboldt (for information).

157. 10. **Remarks from the Chair of Senate – Question/Comments from Senators.**

Dr. N. Bose, Chair of Senate and President and Vice-Chancellor, *pro tempore* provided the following updates:

- Faculty/Unit visits – brown bag luncheons – have visited the Faculty of Medicine, School of Graduate Studies, School of Pharmacy and the Faculty of Business Administration.
- MUN Pensioner’s Association Tribute Awards reception on December 5. Dr. Steven B. Wolintez was the recipient.
- Board meeting on December 7.
- President’s Awards ceremony 2023 – honouring the teaching, research, public engagement and professional accomplishments of outstanding faculty and staff.
- Search for the Chief Information Officer – Memorial is beginning a search for a permanent CIO. As part of the search, your input regarding the current information technology and information protection environments, as well as criteria you believe is important in selecting the new CIO.

Dr. Bose excused himself from the meeting at 4:37 pm

158. 11. **Remarks from the Deputy Chair of Senate – Question/Comments from Senators**

The Chair invited Dr. J. Lokash, Deputy Chair of Senate to speak.

The Deputy Chair of Senate provided an update on a number of items from the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) portfolio, including:

- Welcome to our newly appointed Deans – Dr. Pamela Osmond-Jones, Dean of Education and started on December 1, 2023; Dr. Anne-Marie Sullivan, Dean of the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation; and Dr. Amy Warren, Associate Vice-President (Academic) and Dean of Graduate Studies.

Dr. Lokash welcomed Mr. Glenn Barnes, Chair of the Board of Regents, to Senate to provide an update on the Presidential Search. She motioned for Senate to approve that Mr. Glenn Barnes, Chair of the Board of Regents, be granted speaking privileges at Senate for the duration of the current Presidential search process.

The motion was moved by Dr. Ride and seconded by Dr. Brown; the motion was carried. No members opposed or abstained.

Dr. Lokash invited Mr. Barnes to speak.

Mr. Barnes thanked Dr. Lokash for the invitation to present an update on the search for Memorial's next President and Vice-Chancellor. He noted that in the spirit of collegial governance, he was pleased to join the meeting to share the latest information on the Presidential search process.

He advised that at the December 7 meeting of the Board of Regents the terms of reference and membership structure for the Presidential Search (PSC) was approved. He shared some context for these decisions:

The *Memorial University Act* Section 51 on the Appointment of the President lays out the Boards authority to conduct the presidential search and appointment; in addition there are the [Presidential Search, Selection and Appointment Policy](#) and related procedures. Most specifically we are committed to the establishment of a Presidential Search Committee that contains a mix of individuals that represents the values of the University and can provide the expertise and experience needed by the PSC. In the selection of the PSC, consideration must be given to the indigenization, equity, diversity, and inclusion goals of the University and evaluate whether the committee is advancing these goals. The PSC, will have representation from several groups, including Regents, faculty, students, academic administrators, non-academic administrators and the general public.

The procedures outline multiple points but most specifically for Senate, ensuring the views of Senate have been captured in the consultation process through the community consultation, representation on the PSC, and though further outreach if deemed necessary;

The actual resolutions of the Board for the 2023 Presidential Search Committee (PSC):



### Terms of Reference

To conduct a search for a new President of Memorial University using a process that is transparent and accountable, while maintaining the necessary confidentiality of potential candidates, and that is guided by and in compliance with the letter, spirit and intent of the *Memorial University Act* as well as the Presidential Search, Selection and Appointment Policy and applicable Procedure.

### Membership Structure

The Presidential Search Committee shall comprise:

- (a) The Chair of the Board as chair of the Committee;
- (b) Four other Board of Regents members, to be chosen by the Chair\*;
- (c) Four members of the faculty, chosen by the Senate, with one member from each of the St. John's Campus, Grenfell Campus, Labrador Campus, and the Marine Institute;
- (d) Two students, chosen by the Chair after consultation with:
  - Memorial University of Newfoundland Students' Union (MUNSU);
  - Marine Institute Students' Union (MISU);
  - Graduate Students' Union (GSU);
  - Grenfell Campus Students' Union (GCSU);
- (e) An academic administrator, chosen by them from among themselves;
- (f) A non-academic administrator, chosen by them from among themselves;
- (g) One member of the public-at-large, chosen by the Chair\*;

\* Note: There will be a call for expressions of interest among the Regents and the general public to identify nominees from these groups.

The Secretary of the Board of Regents will serve as Secretary of the Presidential Search Committee and the Executive Director, University Governance Secretariat, will provide advice to and support the work of the Presidential Search Committee.

Mr. Barnes advised Senate that he would be writing Senate very shortly to request the names of four members of faculty (chosen by Senate, with one member from each of the St. John's Campus, Grenfell Campus, Labrador Campus and the Marine Institute) for the Presidential Search Committee (PSC). The time commitment for members who serve on the PSC will be significant over a 6-9 month search process, including attending committee meetings, participating in stakeholder consultation sessions, reviewing applications and interviewing candidates. Attendance at all committee meetings is required. At various points in the search process and with the approval of the PSC, he would provide further updates and would consult with Senate at various stages of the search process.

### Questions from the Floor

Mr. J. Chowdhury asked for clarity regarding "chosen by Chair"? He questioned whether collegial governance could happen this way. The Board of Regents has recognized that there are four student union groups, why is it only 2 student representatives are being asked to sit on this committee?

Mr. Barnes noted that having 2 student representatives on the PSC was consistent with past searches and trying to ensure that the PSC does not get too large. Also, the University's policy currently dictates that the Board Chair makes the final selection – after a public and group wide expressions of interest – is the way the policy reads. Mr. Barnes mentioned that the policy can be changed, noting that policies can be changed at any time but at this juncture that is the policy. We can look at changing it in the future but to change it now would slow down the search process.

Dr. M. Woods noted that it was good to have this interaction with the Board. He asked how are you going to improve on trying to get more potentially appropriate candidates?

Mr. Barnes noted he could not speak on behalf of the search committee, which has yet to be comprised, he mentioned he thought more consultation, time, information and updates with Senate and the Board would be needed during this Search. Also, he would suggest to the PSC to consider potential candidates who are passionate about Memorial, committed to Newfoundland and Labrador and want to be Memorial's President and suggest to the PSC not only read CVs, reference checks, but to ask as many questions as possible i.e., are they visionaries, are they good managers, do they get along with people – things that are not apparent on CVs and in interviews.

Dr. Woods then asked if the plan was to use head hunters or search consultant firms?

Mr. Barnes replied that this would be one of the first discussions and decisions of the PSC. He did mention that Memorial's internal Human Resources consultants may not have the skill sets, experiences, network of contacts, needed to assist with a Presidential search. External search consultants, tend to have that wide network, they tend to know who is out there and who is seeking this type of employment. The PSC will decide.

Dr. E. Fraser asked if faculty members sitting on the PSC need to be on Senate or just selected by Senate?

Mr. Barnes replied that it was his understanding that the faculty members were selected by Senate and open to any faculty member.

Dr. E. Bezzina asked if the search would be an open or closed search?

Mr. Barnes replied that it would be a decision made by the PSC. He did express that there were some pros and cons with either an open or closed search.

Dr. P. Dold wanted to express her support from Mr. Chowdhury's request for additional student representation on the PSC. She wanted to stress the importance of finding ways to ensure that students have a loud strong voice in this search process.

Mr. Barnes replied that the fact that the Board of Regents (BOR) has already approved the number of student representation on the PSC does not mean that he cannot go back to the BOR and ask them to reconsider the number of student representatives on the PSC. He noted that the BOR already had a fair amount of discussion around that very question when the structure was developed and agreed on having two student representatives was also consistent with the last few Presidential searches and the size of the PSC. Mr. Barnes advised he would follow up with the BOR regarding the request to increase the number of student representatives on the PSC.

Ms. Broders echoed the request to reconsider the number of student representatives on the PSC expressed by Mr. Chowdhury and Dr. Dold. She advised that historically it had been thought that having a graduate and undergraduate representative was sufficient. There are four student unions' at this university who represent four different populations of students and it is important to increase the student representation. Also, recognizing that it is the choice of the Chair, she urged the Chair to consult with MUNSU concerning the student elections. They have held internal elections for the Provost search committee and for other on-going search committees. It is important that the number of student representatives on the PSC be increased and also the way that student representatives are appointed by respecting the authority of the student unions. The student unions are here to talk about how to do that best.

Mr. Barnes clarified that the PSC would be asking the student unions' to provide student representatives for the search committee and to keep in that the search is a fairly intense 6 to 9 month process.

Dr. M. Haghiri enquired regarding the criteria of Senator in order to choose a candidate from each constituency – do they need to be tenured, not tenured, assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, part- time, PTA, or TTA – have they been identified?

Mr. Barnes advised that he was unaware. He understood that it is up to faculty to decide their own rules and their own process for selecting their representatives. The Chair did not think it was appropriate for the BOR to dictate who from a constituency should be on the PSC.

Ms. M. Wells asked if part-time faculty be considered to sit on the PSC or per-course instructors?

Mr. Barnes replied that it would be full time faculty members, not part-time or per-course faculty.

Mr. N. Keough noted the need to increase the number of student representatives on the PSC. He advised that the students over the past year have been really frustrated with the actions of upper administration and with the change in upper administration, student unions have been promised that we would see a lot more collegial governance, and not only with faculty but also with students.

Mr. N. Gillingham noted that there were issues with the previous President with authentic indigenous status. Did this exist in the last process and if so, did you revise it?

Mr. Barnes replied that he did not know the answer to that question, because he was not on the search committee the last time. He noted that the University is in the process of an indigenous verification and that the PSC would consult with the Vice-President (Indigenous) when considering that selection.

Dr. N. Hurley inquired about the process by which an academic administrator and non-academic administrator would be selected among consistencies. Is this a nomination process or is this a vote? Can you give more information about that?

Mr. Barnes replied that it was his understanding that there would be an expression of interest within each of those groups, with nominations being forwarded to the PSC. All the details would be finalized and shared when the PSC is established. He thanked the members of Senate for their time.

Dr. Lokash thanked Mr. Barnes and asked that Dr. Bose be asked to come back to the meeting.

The Deputy Chair of Senate continued with her update:

- Happy Holidays Celebration on December 14 from 3 to 6 pm at the Breezeway – and are asked to bring a non-perishable food item or a monetary contribution in support of the campus food back.
- The traditional carol sing on December 22 from 10:30 am to 11:30 am; which will be followed by refreshments in the lobby of the DF Cook Recital Hall, School of Music.

Dr. Bose, Chair of Senate returned to the meeting at 5:07 pm

159. **Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial**

Senate moved into a closed session for this item of business in accordance with *Section IV.E.2. Senate Meetings and Procedures of the Handbook of Senate By-Laws and Procedures* which reads:

*Matters of a confidential nature, including honorary degrees, shall be discussed in closed session; observers are not permitted to attend closed sessions.*

The names of 8 candidates recommended by the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial were presented to the Senate for awarding of doctoral degrees honoris causa. Members were given the opportunity to discuss the merits of each of the candidates before voting. Upon voting by a show of hands, 7 candidates was approved by at least a two-thirds majority vote and 1 candidate was not approved.

The name of 1 candidate recommended by the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial was presented to the Senate for the award of title of Professor Emeritus for eventual consideration by the Board of Regents. Members were given the opportunity to discuss the merits of the candidate before voting. Upon voting by a show of hands, the 1 candidate was approved by at least a two-thirds majority vote.

160. **Adjournment:**

It was moved by Dr. M. Woods and seconded by Dr. D. McKeen and carried that the meeting of Senate be adjourned at 5:40 pm.

---

CHAIR

---

SECRETARY