

**Motion to reconsider Deputy Provost membership on Senate
October 24, 2011**

Motion:

I move that Senate reconsider the Motion **“It is moved by the Senate Operations Review Committee that the Deputy Provost position be added to the ex-officio roster of Senate on an interim basis until the final composition of Senate is determined by SORC and ratified by Senate.”** that was passed at the September 2011 meeting of Senate for the following reasons:

In the Queen’s Senate [meeting of 27 September 2011](#), the Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC) [moved](#) that a new *ex officio* position in Senate be created for Vice-Provost Cole. Senator Morelli asked how the addition of an administrative *ex officio* position would affect the longstanding principle that faculty hold the majority of positions in Senate. Principal Woolf replied that the vice-provost is also a faculty member, and that in any case Senate makes no distinction between faculty and administrative positions. The vote was then taken and the SORC motion was carried.

Principal Woolf’s response showed little comprehension of the matter of Senate’s composition, and in fact misled Senate on this vote. Senate has been “a representative body”—i.e., one whose membership is meant to represent the university’s varied composition— since 1913, and it both confirmed and refined its policy of representative composition when it adopted “the principle of

In its "[Interim Report on the Composition of Senate \(April 22, 2010\)](#)," SORC itself refers to the "guiding principle" of "proportionate composition as directed by Senate in 1996," and lists the following proportions: that

- x Faculty members never be less than 54%;
- x Ex-officio members never be more than 19%;
- x Student members never be less than 23%
- x

minimum of 54% recommended in 1996). The creation of a new *ex officio* position for the Vice-Provost has changed these numbers to 17, 36, 16, and 3, for a faculty complement of exactly 50%. Thus, Senator Morelli's observation that the creation of the new *ex officio* position would breach "the principle of the faculty constituting a majority voice" was precisely correct.

If Senate has taken pains to maintain this principle in the past, why is it now being breached? To reclaim its prescribed majority of 54%, assuming that all other positions (including the new *ex officio* position) remain constant, the faculty complement should be increased by 7, to a total of 43 (17 *ex officio* + 43 faculty + 16 students + 3 staff = 79, and $43 / 79 = 54\%$).

But Senate should also attend to the "principle," enunciated in 1996, confirmed by SORC in 2009, and quoted above, that "Ex-officio members never be *more* than 19%" (emphasis added). At present, with 17 out of 72 Senate positions, the *ex officio* members have 24% of the seats in Senate. Everything else remaining constant, they now have four seats in excess of the balance prescribed in 1996.

Given the wish that has often been expressed not to increase any further the numbers in Senate (see Hooey), the best solution might be to transfer three seats from