



TO: Senate Nominating Committee
FROM: Anthony C. Masi, Provost
SUBJECT: Formation of Statutory Selection Committees
DATE: 16 March 2010
DOCUMENT #: D09-49

ACTION REQUIRED: INFORMATION DISCUSSION APPROVAL/DECISION

ISSUE: The current mechanism for selecting the members of Statutory Selection Committees (SSCs) is unwieldy, and this proposal is intended to streamline the process, removing problems experienced with the current process.

MOTION OR RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL: Be it resolved that Senate, on the recommendation of the Senate Nominating Committee, delegate to the Senate Nominating Committee the authority and responsibility to select the pool of candidates eligible to serve as representatives of Senate on Statutory Selection Committees as proposed in Senate document D09-49.

BACKGROUND & RATIONALE: The composition of SSCs is governed by the Statutes:

3.4.3 Before recommending an appointment to the rank of full professor or full librarian, the Principal must first have consulted a committee consisting of two governors selected by the Chair of the Board, two vice-principals, the dean of any faculty in which the appointment is to be made, or, in the case of appointment to the rank of full librarian, the Director of Libraries, and two members selected by the Senate; and such other members as the Principal may see fit.

Other than requiring that it be the Senate that selects the two members, the Statutes and regulations are silent as to details of the process to be used to select, and the qualifications of, those members. However, it is established practice that they be full professors/librarians, and that they

should not, in general, be from the same faculty as the candidate. (Senate Nominating Committee decision, March 18, 2008)

Current selection process

Currently, for each candidate for promotion, the dean/Director (hereafter “dean”) proposes the names of two members and two alternates, all from outside the faculty/Library (hereafter “faculty”) of the candidate for promotion. If there are two or more candidates from a faculty, the established practice is that the dean proposes different members and alternates from outside the faculty for each candidate - a total of at least eight names. Thus, given that on average 25 SSCs are established each year each requiring its own unique membership of four professors (2 members + 2 alternates), deans collectively must propose (on average) the names of a total of approximately 100 full professors from faculties other than their own.

These names are received by the University Secretariat as and when requests for the establishment of SSCs are received. The names are then forwarded to the Senate Nominating Committee for approval and, in turn, are recommended by Senate Nominating Committee to Senate for approval. If a name is disapproved by Senate Nominating or Senate, the process begins again with the dean proposing substitute names.

When, and only when, Senate approval is received are the nominees informed by the University Secretariat of their appointment to an SCC. It is only at this point that it is learned whether the individual nominees are available and willing and able to serve. If a nominee, for whatever reason, is not in a position to serve, the whole process must again start de novo with the relevant dean proposing

It is only when all nominees are in place that an SSC meeting can be scheduled.

Scheduling SSCs

All agree that it would be convenient and appropriate that when there is more than one candidate for promotion in a faculty in a given semester, all the SSCs should be scheduled together. However, this can pose a significant challenge as it requires the availability not only of the Senate nominees (and alternates), but also the Provost, two Board members and one other (academic) vice-principal - all of who are busy persons with full and often not very flexible agendas. Thus, to find a time to hold (say) four SSCs for the same faculty the schedules of eight Senate nominees and eight Senate alternates (16 professors) plus the five other members, must be accommodated. This often results in a delay of several months and/or the scheduling of the SSCs on different days – and it does result in a backlog of cases awaiting consideration (and requests to the Board of Governors to back-date some

promotions).

Proposed selection process for Senate nominees

No change is proposed to the statutory composition of SSCs set out in article 3.4.3. Rather the proposal is that the established practice for the appointment of the SSC Senate nominees be reformed to allow:

- (i) For the creation of a pre-approved pool of full professors nominated from each faculty by the Dean, who would be available to serve as representatives of Senate on SSCs for promotion candidates from faculties other than their own.
- (ii) For review, revision, and approval of the pool by the Senate Nominating Committee on behalf of Senate.

It is proposed that each dean recommend to the University Secretariat from their faculty the names of 3 - 4 (small faculties) or 6 - 8 (large faculties) professors as potential SSC members. These names would then be forwarded to the Senate Nominating Committee for approval. This would allow for the creation of an SSC panel from which Senate nominees and alternates could be drawn in a timely manner for each SSC as needed. Once approved by the Nominating Committee, the list of those constituting the pool would be forwarded to Senate for information.

- (iii) Senate nominees would be able to serve on more than one SSC for a faculty at any given time
- (iv) Senate nominees would be chosen on the basis of availability and on a rotational basis by the Secretary-General from the members of the approved pool of full professors (other than those from the candidate's faculty).

Although in practice this is done, it has been proposed that the composition of SSCs be changed to explicitly include the Chair and Director of any unit in which the appointment to full professor is to be made. This requires an amendment to article 3.4.3 of the Statutes, which will have to go through the normal channels for approval.

Timing

Ideally the deans' nominees would reach the University Secretariat by the end of February of each year and would be presented to Senate Nominating at its March meeting.

Term

It is proposed that panel members serve for two-year renewable terms with half the members being initially appointed for a one-year renewable term, thus ensuring some annual turnover that would provide for both continuity and renewal in the pool each year.

Reporting

Once approved by the Nominating Committee, a list of those full professors who constitute the pool of Senate representatives on SCCs for that year will be provided to Senate for information.

In addition, at the end of the annual SSC process, a report will be provided to Senate for information indicating in aggregate form a summary of the SSC process, including such items as the number of SSCs constituted, the members of the pool appointed in that year, the distribution of candidates by faculty, and the number of promotions recommended.

CONSULTATION: Senate Nominating Committee, February 2 and 16, 2010
Senate Steering Committee, February 2 and March 16, 2010

NEXT STEPS: Implementation

APPENDICES: None
