



**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE**

**April 17, 2015**

The meeting was held at 1:30 p.m. in



The Vice-Chair then opened the floor to debate.

There were 21 speakers to the substance of the motion with respect to the President. Ten spoke in support of the motion of non-confidence; ten spoke against the motion; one noted that, though concerned about the President's actions, she was also concerned about the potential impact of a non-confidence vote and would abstain. All speakers stressed their concern that Senate and the university community act in the best interests of Western and its future success.

Those in support of the motion highlighted the following concerns:

- x On the specific compensation issue, the decision to monetize the administrative leave was an instance of bad judgment that has not been erased by the decision to return the funds. Returning the money is not enough. The President's decision to activate the leave monetization clause in his contract and the Board Chair's approval of that action, represented a disregard for and total lack of understanding of the difficulties that are being faced by departments, and by individual faculty and students across the board, but especially graduate students. It flies in the face of the constant messages that have been put out by the senior administration about the need for fiscal restraint.
- x Concern was expressed about the impact of compensation decision on Western's relationship with government at a crucial point when the government is facing financial difficulties and, coincidentally, is reviewing the funding formula for post-secondary institutions.
- x Many noted that the compensation issue was reflective of greater issues with the style of the administration, a style categorized as "top down," divisive(s)-8(i)-8.9(v.3(w)4(e(s)z t)-1Td <7pat)-1.1(i)

been raised in the context of his faculty's accreditation review. Others suggested that negative impact on fund raising and donor relations could affect the ability of faculty to carry out the research they wished to do.

- x The proposal for a vote of non-confidence was an emotional response not supported by any objective data with respect to the President's competence. He had recently undergone a five-year review and been reappointed which would seem to speak to his abilities. Anecdotes and unsupported arguments were not sufficient in an academic environment to reach a vote of non-confidence. His achievements were being ignored.
- x The passion that was evident through this discussion and in the days preceding should be harnessed and used for the good of the university going forward.

Moved by V. Nolte, seconded by R. Mercer

That the vote on the motion be conducted by secret ballot.

In favour of a secret ballot it was argued that it was necessary because of the fear of reprisals that had been referred to earlier in the meeting. Against the motion it was argued that a secret ballot would run counter to the need for greater transparency in decision making, and that Senators who did not wish to stand up and be counted in this important matter were abdicating their responsibility.

