



ACADEMIC COUNCIL REPORT

Action Required:

Public:
Non-Public:

Discussion
Decision

TO: Academic Council

DATE: January 19, 2016

FROM: Deborah Saucier, Provost and Vice President Academic

SUBJECT: COU Academic Colleague and Alternate Appointment Process

A. Purpose

To obtain Academic Council’s feedback and direction on the proposed appointment process for the COU Academic Colleague and Alternate.

B. Background

At the Academic Council meeting on June 16, 2015, Academic Council considered the reappointment of Mark Green as the COU Academic Colleague (“AC”) for an additional term. The Council discussed the past practice of selecting the AC and there was general consensus that the process should be formalized. There was also discussion regarding the value of having an alternate AC. The Council reappointed Mark Green as AC for an additional term ending June 30, 2016, with the intention of selecting a replacement according to a formal process during 2015-16 so that the new AC could be mentored by Mark Green during the remainder of his term to ensure a smooth transition.

C. Main Issues and Recommendations

Upon reviewing COU’s requirements and conducting some benchmarking, we make the following recommendations:

1. Term:

COU provides that the Academic Colleague shall normally hold office for a term of 3 years, renewable. Western, Laurier, York, OCAD, Queen’s, and Carleton appoint

Academic Colleagues for terms of 3 years. Several institutions limit renewal to 1 additional term.

Recommendation:

That Academic Council elect the AC and alternate AC for 3 year terms with the possibility of renewal for one additional 3 year term in order to allow for increased Council member participation in the COU.

2. Eligibility:

The COU requires that the Academic Colleague must be “*selected for membership by the academic senate or equivalent senior academic body from among the academic staff who are current members of that body or who could be appointed to it while serving as a colleague*”. There are some institutions that require the Academic Colleague to be a member of senate at the time of nomination (OCAD, Trent, Laurier), while others don't (York, Lakehead, Windsor).

Recommendation:

In accordance with the COU Constitution, the eligibility requirements to be nominated as AC should be the same as those for nomination as a member of Academic Council. If the successful candidate is not already a member of Council, we would invite the individual to attend all Council meetings as a guest to ensure the connection and communication between Academic Council and the COU. By opening eligibility to faculty who are not already members of Academic Council, this will prevent the issue of trying to match up the Academic Colleague's term with his/her term on Academic Council.

3. Nominations & Voting:

The COU Constitution provides that the Academic Colleague must be selected for membership by the academic senate or equivalent senior academic body.

Recommendation:

To ensure this COU provision is met, nominations should be sought from Academic Council members. The Academic Council Executive Committee may also make nominations in addition to any put forward by Council. The Election procedures should be the same as those set out in the Academic Council Procedures for the Election of Teaching, Non-academic Staff and Student Representatives. Voting would be open to Academic Council members only.