

Memo

To: Chairs Faculty Councils
From: Poonam Puri, Chair of Senate
Date: 15 February 2023
Subject: **Consultation on Markham Representation in Governance**

As required by the Rules of Senate, (Section 2, P. 2.19-2.20, *Periodic Review and Publication of Senate Membership Reviews*), the Senate Executive Committee is this year undertaking a task to review the membership of Senate to determine the allocation of seats among the faculty members on Senate effective as of 1 July 2023. With its launch in 2024, the exercise this year has begun to consider how to integrate representation from the Markham campus on Senate. In the next academic year - 2023-2024 - Executive intends to recommend to Senate a new membership model to be implemented effective 1 July 2024 coincident with the launch of the new campus for FW'24.

The Senate Executive Committee has drafted various membership models that reflect representation from the new campus. Executive earlier requested from the four Faculties who will be delivering programming at Markham (AMPD, LAPS, Lassonde and Science) to share their views on how the campus should be integrated into Senate membership (in addition to the inclusion of the Deputy Provost Markham as a voting member of Senate; approved by Senate 2022) to inform its recommendation to Senate on a membership model. The Senate Committee wishes now to extend the consultation exercise to all Faculty Councils to provide an opportunity for broad input on the important matter of the membership of Senate.

Below is a brief set of questions to which Executive kindly requests responses from your respective Faculty Council. Replies are respectively requested at the earliest opportunity, but at least by **Friday, 5 May 2023**, sent care of Cheryl Underhill (underhil@yorku.ca), University Secretariat.



Questions:

Senate Membership

Appended to this communication are several possible Senate membership models to integrate representation from the Markham campus. Senate Executive has begun discussing them.

From your Faculty perspective:

- Is there a preferred model that best supports the effective integration of the campus in Senate governance?
- Do any of the models have significant disadvantages?
- In two of the models, there is a choice between reallocating existing seats or adding seats to Senate. Which one of these two options is favored?

Many thanks for providing your input into this important governance exercise.

Senate Membership Models to Integrate Markham Campus: For comment by Faculty Councils



Model #1: Minimal Change



Capsule Description of Model	Assumptions and Considerations	Faculty Members	Students	Change in Senate Size
<p>Minimal change involving the application of current model for faculty members teaching at Markham Campus (MC)</p>	<p>Keep faculty member seat allocation constant at 99</p> <p>Keep student seat allocation constant at 28 (2/Faculty; with 6 for LA&PS)</p> <p>4 anchor Faculties are delivering programming at MC (AMPD, LAPS, Lassonde, Science)</p>	<p>Determine full-time faculty member seat allocations by Faculty per existing formula</p> <p>MC representation <u>encouraged/required</u> with 1 MC faculty member elected to Senate from each anchor Faculty</p> <p>(<u>encouraged</u> means that each anchor Faculty would decide on its own whether it wants to allocate a seat or not)</p>	<p><u>Encourage/require</u> that students reserve one of their seats for a MC student (one of the LAPS enriched cohort?)</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Potentially 5 MC seats from within existing Faculty allocations</p>

Model #2: Markham Campus as a Faculty-like Entity



Capsule Description of Model	Assumptions and Considerations	Faculty Members	Students	Change in Senate Size
<p>Treat the Markham Campus (MC) as a Faculty-like Entity</p>	<p>Programs are diverse and span multiple Faculties and interdisciplinary programs, making a Faculty approach feasible</p> <p>Allow MC faculty member allocation to grow consistent with general membership formula; cap elected faculty member seats at 99 or adjust upward?</p> <p>Allocate MC student membership to grow consistent with general rules; cap student seats at 28 or adjust upward?</p>	<p>Determine full-time faculty member seat allocations by Faculty per existing formula</p> <p>At the outset, apply the “minimum of four” rule, including MC</p> <p>Reallocate within existing Faculty seats or add 4 seats for MC faculty members</p>	<p>Reallocate existing student seats or add 2 seats for MC students in keeping with general Senate rules (Exception: LA&PS currently has 6 seats)</p>	<p>Reallocation within existing seats (so no size change)</p> <p>or</p> <p>Add 6 seats for MC (4 faculty member seats and 2 student seats)</p>

Model #3: Blended



Capsule Description of Model	Assumptions and Considerations	Faculty Members	Students	Change in Senate Size
<p>Blended Recognition of Markham Campus (MC)</p>	<p>Allow MC faculty member and student allocations to grow but more modestly</p>	<p>Determine full-time faculty member seat allocations by Faculty per existing formula</p> <p>Create specific rule for MC allocation (e.g. 2 seats for MC faculty members elected by colleagues; current MC complement is roughly half the size of small Faculties)</p>	<p>Create specific rule for MC allocation (e.g., allocate 1 seat to MC students)</p>	<p>Reallocate within existing seats (so no size change)</p> <p>or</p> <p>Add 3 seats for MC (2 faculty member seats and 1 student seat)</p>