

**REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR' TASK FORCE
ON GOVERNANCE OF THE UWI**

George A. O. Alleyne
Keva J. Bethel
Kenneth A. Bobb
Dennis J. Gayle
Lois S. Graham
Elsa A. Leo-Rhynie
Neville V. Nicholls
Joseph R. Pereira

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am pleased to acknowledge the generous financial support of the Commonwealth Secretariat and the International Development Research Center. The Report would not have been possible without the active, dedicated involvement and participation of the members of the Task Force who addressed their task in a collegial yet highly disciplined manner. The work of the Task Force was begun while Professor the Hon. Rex Nettleford was Vice-Chancellor and continued under the Vice Chancellorship of Professor E. Nigel Harris and we thank them both for their counsel. Thanks must also go to the several persons within and without the University community who provided us with their oral and written submissions that have shaped our views and informed our recommendations.

We were fortunate to have the excellent critical comments of Mr. Lee Sanders, Registrar and Secretary of Durham University in the United Kingdom and Professor John Dixon, Associate Vice-Principal (Academic/International) of Queen's University in Canada. The Task Force benefited enormously from the sage advice of Professor Ralph Carnegie, Director of the Caribbean Law Institute Centre and Mrs. Beverley Pereira, University Counsel in the Legal Unit.

Special recognition and thanks must go to Mrs. Lois Graham, Assistant Registrar and Secretary to the Task Force whose efficiency and organising skills were major factors in ensuring that the Task Force carried out its work efficiently and produce a timely Report.

George Alleyne
Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
SECTION 1: BACKGROUND	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 The Decades of the Sixties and Seventies	1
1.3 Restructuring of 1984	2
1.4 The Chancellor's Commission of 1994	3
SECTION 2: THE 2004 TASK FORCE	6
2.1 Formation of the Task Force	6
2.2 Terms of Reference	6
2.3 Form of Work	7
SECTION 3: THE UNIVERSITY TODAY	8
3.1 Changes in the Higher Education Environment in the Caribbean	8
3.2 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Challenges and Threats	10
3.2.1 Strengths	10
3.2.2 Weaknesses	11
3.2.3 Opportunities, Challenges and Threats	13
SECTION 4: THE GOVERNANCE OF THE MAIN UNIVERSITY BODIES	16
4.1 The University Council	16
4.1.1 Finance and General Purposes Committee (F&GPC)	19
4.1.2 University Strategy Committee	21
4.2 Campus Councils and Campus F&GPCs	24
4.2.1 Campus Councils	24
4.2.2 Campus F&GPCs	26
4.3 The University Boards	27
4.3.1 Board for Undergraduate Studies	27
4.3.2 Board for Graduate Studies and Research (The Graduate School)	30
4.3.3 Board for Non-Campus Countries and Distance Education: Relationships with the NCCs	33

SECTION 5: THE POWERS OF SENATE	38
SECTION 6: “A RELEVANT AND RESPECTED REGIONAL INSTITUTION ESSENTIAL TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CARIBBEAN”	41
6.1 Strengthening Regionality	43
6.1.1 Mobility of Staff and Students	43
Staff	43
Students	43
Undergraduate Scholarships for Study at the Three Old Campuses	43
Study at another Campus (Millennium Fund)	44
Summer Educational Tours	44
Single Campus Offerings	44
6.1.2 Academic Oversight	44
SECTION 7: MANAGERIAL ISSUES	46
SECTION 8: INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT	48
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE	49
4.1 : The University Council	49
4.1.1: University Finance & General Purposes Committee	50
4.1.2: University Strategy Committee	50
4.2.1: Campus Councils	51
4.2.2: Campus Finance & General Purposes Committees	51
4.3.1: Board for Undergraduate Studies	51
4.3.2: Board for Graduate Studies & Research (The Graduate School)	52
4.3.3: Board for Non-Campus Countries & Distance Education: Relations with NCCs	53
5 : The Powers of Senate	54
6 : “A Relevant and Respected Regional Institution Essential to the Development of the Caribbean”	54
6.1 : Strengthening Regionality	54
6.1.2: Academic Oversight	54
8 : Institutional Assessment	54
APPENDICES:	55
Appendix I - Recommendations of the Task Force with Accompanying Relevant Statutes and Ordinances	55
Appendix II - Consultants and Submissions	63
Appendix III - Documents Consulted	67
Appendix IV - Meetings of the Task Force	71

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

The University of the West Indies has undergone profound changes over the 57 years of its existence. As with every organism that wishes to improve and remain vibrant and relevant, it must continue to respond proactively to its environment as time and circumstances warrant and change appropriately. But any effort to improve its functioning must be seen in the context of the history of the changes the institution has undergone. Thus, it is useful to review briefly some of the early history of the University, its expansion throughout the region and the accompanying structural changes.

The University has grown from being a small, single-campus University College affiliated to the University of London to become a large and complex, independent institution having major campuses in three Caribbean countries and a presence in every one of the other twelve (12) contributing countries. It has grown from being a single faculty in one campus to having 13 in the three major campuses. Its student body now numbers over 30,000. These expansions have necessitated modifications in the governance of the institution, which we understand and define as the **“structures and processes through which the decisions get made that allow for the optimal functioning of the institution”**.

1.2 The Decades of the Sixties and Seventies

The major expansions that necessitated different governance arrangements can be said to have begun with the incorporation into the University College of the West Indies (UCWI) of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture in Trinidad which became the nucleus of the second Campus of the University in St. Augustine in 1960. At its handover, the then Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, Dr. Eric Williams, envisioned the University growing to be a non-residential decentralized institution which of course ran counter to the original thinking of the founding fathers and implied a much larger enterprise than was initially contemplated.

During the latter part of the 1950s and early 1960s the University was envisaged as one of the key institutions in the new Federation of the West Indies and in April 1962 it was formally established as a University in its own right. The demise of the federal structure caused much concern as to the continuation of the institution as a cooperative Caribbean venture, a concern that has only been partially assuaged over the ensuing years. The completion of the formal decentralization was accompanied by the formation of a third Campus in Barbados in 1963.

The period of the mid-sixties to the mid-seventies was one of major change and ferment in which the University was the focus of intense scrutiny by the Caribbean governments and it did not escape the fallout of several of the difficulties and stresses of the Caribbean integration process. There was a not unjustified fear that the regional character would be fractured irrevocably, especially in light of the establishment of the new campuses in St Augustine and Cave Hill. The need for these was in part due to clear necessity to expand the tertiary education offerings in the Caribbean as well as the legitimate desire of the governments of Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados to have a recognizable university presence in their countries.

There were numerous committees and intergovernmental evaluations culminating in a major revision of the *Charter* and *Statutes* in 1972. The most significant of the results of this restructuring exercise were the recognition of the changed relationship with Guyana which ceased to be a contributing country and established its own university, as well as the consolidation of a significant measure of autonomy for the campuses in both financial and academic matters. However, the governance structure during this period was still very much that of the UK model, with a single Council and major academic and financial committees, although by 1984 many of the matters of finance and general purposes that related to campuses were managed by Campus Finance Committees and academic matters by Campus Academic Boards.

1.3 Restructuring of 1984

As a result of continuous debate and discussion involving the whole range of persons and interests that could be thought of as having a stake in the institution, particularly those at the political level, another major restructuring exercise of the University was begun in 1982 which sought to resolve the tension between the preservation of the regional nature of the University and even further devolution of autonomy to the three campuses. Much of the change was due to the desire of the three major contributing countries to have a greater input into the way campuses were governed and managed. This was no doubt stimulated or aided by academics in those campuses who wished for greater autonomy and a desire to abolish what was often referred to in pejorative terms as “Monacentricity”. The wish of the non-campus countries (NCCs) to see an institution more responsive to their needs also played a significant role in these developments.

As the official documents state: *“The new structure will preserve the regional character of the University while, at the same time, giving greater autonomy to each campus to enable it to more respond to national needs, with specific arrangements for meeting the needs of the non-campus countries.*

These principles would be translated into Campus Councils governing each campus and separate Campus Grants Committees to deal with the financing of each campus. There would still be, however, a central University Council and a University Grants Committee. The central University authorities will remain the custodian of academic standards and will have the responsibility of initiating programmes for the specific benefit of the non-campus countries, with the assistance of the campuses”.

The new structure was introduced in 1984, and from an operational point of view, perhaps the most significant development was the conceptualisation of what has come to be known as the “Centre” as an identifiable entity, with a separate budget, also with reserved functions for which the Vice-Chancellor was given executive responsibility. The Office of University Services was established to respond directly to the needs of the NCCs. The functions of this office have subsequently been assigned to the Board for Non-Campus Countries and Distance Education (BNCCs&DE).

The mode of financing of the Centre budget proved to be problematic. It was not allotted separately, but was dependent on transfer of funds allotted to the individual campuses. The structure was complicated by the fact that the Vice-Chancellor in addition to being responsible for the Centre retained the headship of the Mona Campus. However, the final separation of the Centre and Vice-Chancellor from campus responsibility took place in 1988 with the establishment of the office of Principal of the Mona Campus as separate from the office of Vice-Chancellor and the development of a separate institutional structure for the office of Vice-Chancellor.

It appears that there was persisting discomfort after the 1984 restructuring because of the dependency of the Centre for funding on the allocations to the individual campuses. This was in spite of the assertion that the Centre in addition to its other core university-wide functions would have responsibility for the NCCs. The documentation of that period leaves the impression that the establishment of structures at campus level, similar if not identical to those for the University as a whole, contributed to strengthening the centrifugal forces that threatened the regional nature and capability of the institution especially in relation to the NCCs.

1.4 The Chancellor’s Commission of 1994

The last major exercise in the restructuring of the University was undertaken in 1994 by the Chancellor’s Commission on Governance. This arose as a result of the decision of Council which was based on “concern about the need to streamline the administration of the university to bring it in step with current and prospective needs and trends and to improve its effectiveness”. It was also felt that after 10 years with the new structure, it was time to examine how it had functioned and correct any problems it had engendered. One should note the concern for the need to streamline the administration.

This exercise took as a given the virtue of the regional character of the institution that had been enunciated so clearly by the CARICOM Heads of Government in Grand Anse in 1989. In their “Resolution on Human Resources Development and the University of the West Indies” they: ***decided that in view of the major role which the University of the West Indies is being called upon to play, it should remain a regional institution indefinitely.***

This Report of the Chancellor’s Commission records an extensive and thorough exercise which examined virtually all aspects of the University’s functions and although it intended to separate governance from management, it did highlight some crucial

managerial problems that needed to be addressed. It is instructive that that exercise was carried out by a body “external” to the University but did not involve directly the governments as such. This is in direct contrast with previous exercises which saw intense government participation in the details of the restructuring process. One might interpret this as a sign that the governments had developed a great measure of trust in the institution and perhaps it was also a tribute to the esteem in which the Chancellor, Sir Shridath Ramphal and the Vice-Chancellor, Sir Alister McIntyre were held.

The major aspects of that Report with salience for the present exercise relate to the University Centre, the Campuses, and the governance and management of the central university bodies. Its recommendations dealt with administrative and financial reform as well as the structural changes necessary to enhance the competitiveness and status of the University.

A critical aspect of the recommendations was to define the role of the Centre as strategic, with responsibility for ensuring that the Grand Anse Declaration was made a reality. The first and perhaps crucial recommendation said:

“The role of the University Centre should be primarily strategic: it should divest itself of decision making in a wide range of areas including first degree matters so that it can concentrate on strategic planning, the maintenance of the University’s international reputation, relations with governments, the needs of the non-campus countries, the generation of funding and ensuring that the University is fully committed to regional development”. It is interesting to note that the Centre was assigned a strategic role in the university while at the same time it was expected to discharge operational responsibility for the NCCs.

One important effect of the restructuring was to strengthen substantially the power and authority of the Vice-Chancellor. This was achieved in part by following the recommendations of the Commission that the governments make direct payments to the Centre rather than through the campuses.

In terms of the central university bodies, the Commission proposed a structure simpler than the one in existence which was felt to be overburdened with committees almost to the extent of institutional paralysis. There was to be a re-formulation of the composition and role of Council and a re-organisation of the bodies that were major committees. There would be Finance and General Purposes Committee, University Strategy Committee, Audit Committee, University Appointments Committee and three new Boards – the Board for Graduate Studies and Research (BGSR), the Board for Undergraduate Studies (BUS) and the Board for Non-Campus Countries and Distance Education (BNCCs&DE). According to the Commission’s Report, one of the critical recommendations in this area was to recommend the creation of a Graduate School. It was evident that there was considerable concern about the composition and functioning of the University Council and the Report was clear in its concept how that body should operate. It said:

“...Council should serve as the forum, whereby the UWI is judged as to whether it is meeting the needs of its many publics. It is the body on which representatives of all the

governments and people drawn from the industrial, commercial and professional life of the region sit, and the agenda of its meetings should be constructed so as to provide ample opportunity for debate about the larger issues, the University's progress and its successes and failures (and all institutions have them), and should not allow itself to become bogged down in formal business. A consequence of this enhanced role is that it should meet more frequently than simply once a year so that it can play the significant policy and directional role, which its terms of reference and powers imply”.

The new structure and the reshaping of the various committees also had the effect of shifting strategic and planning authority from the campus to the central level and drastic reduction of the participation of academics and academic managers (Deans) in the major decision-making bodies at central level. The recommendation for the elimination of Senate was not followed and one of the issues which remain unresolved is the locus and authority for the execution of those powers of Senate which have not been devolved to the new Boards or other authority. The recommendations of the Commission were duly adopted by Council in 1994 and after intensive work on the necessary redrafting of the *Statutes* and *Ordinances* to give effect to the changes proposed, the new structure took effect in 1996.

SECTION 2: THE 2004 TASK FORCE

Sir George Alleyne was appointed Chancellor in September 2003 and on his assumption of office he received numerous comments to the effect that 10 years had passed since the 1994 Report and it would be prudent for the University to examine how the new structures had functioned and whether it was necessary to adjust them in light of regional and global developments. Consequently, at the 2004 Annual Business Meeting of Council, the Chancellor signaled his intention to convene a small Task Force to examine some critical aspects of the governance of the institution, with special reference to the Council and the major central committees. Given his statutory role as chair of Council, it is an essential part of his responsibility to ensure that it fulfilled its functions as mandated by the *Charter* and *Statutes* and as laid out in the 1994 Governance Report. A deliberate decision was taken that the review would not include the operation of the University at the level of the Faculties and Departments, reasoning that the changes instituted post-1996 have been gradual and were of more local concern on the Campuses. Perhaps this will be the subject of some examination in the future. Although cost is always an important consideration, the review was driven more by the wish to improve efficiency. The cost of the major organs of governance represents no more than 0.15% of the annual approved expenditure in 2005/2006.

2.1 Formation of the Task Force

The Task Force was nominated by the Vice-Chancellor in consultation with the Chancellor and comprised the following:

Sir George Alleyne, Chancellor, **Chair**

Sir Neville Nicholls, Chair of the Cave Hill Campus Council

Dr. Keva Bethel, President Emerita of the College of the Bahamas

Mr Joseph Pereira, Deputy Principal, Mona Campus

Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor Elsa Leo-Rhynie, Chair of the Board for Undergraduate Studies

Professor Dennis Gayle, Executive Director of the Institute of International Relations

Mr. Kenneth Bobb, President of the Guild of Students, Cave Hill

Mrs. Lois Graham, Assistant Registrar, Secretary

The Task Force was assisted by Professor Ralph Carnegie, Executive Director of the Caribbean Law Institute Centre at Cave Hill and Mrs. Beverley Pereira, University Counsel.

2.2 Terms of Reference

The initial terms of Reference of the Task Force were:

- 1) To examine the composition and functioning of the major organs of governance of the University at Centre and campus levels with a view to improving their ability to

produce the policies, strategies and pertinent decisions needed in a University that will continue to be a relevant and respected regional institution essential to the development of the Caribbean.

- 2) To examine the possible mechanisms to preserve and strengthen the image and presence of the University in its “non-Campus” countries.

It was subsequently decided to extend the examination to the three Boards created as a result of the 1994 Commission’s Report.

2.3 Form of work

The Task Force invited comments from the University Community and specifically targeted the senior academic and administrative staff. Several of these submitted detailed written statements which sometimes formed the basis of subsequent personal interviews. Comments were also obtained from the Chairs of the Campus Councils, the Campus Principals, the Student Guilds and the Vice-Chancellors Emeriti. Comments were solicited from the Caribbean Ministers of Education and extensive interviews were carried out with several of them. The views of the Chancellor’s nominees on Council were sought specifically. The Task Force also benefited from papers prepared on various relevant topics.

SECTION 3: THE UNIVERSITY TODAY

3.1 Changes in the Higher Education Environment in the Caribbean

The higher education environment in the Caribbean has changed significantly since the 1994 Commission's Report and this must have relevance for the University and how it functions. The demand for growth in the tertiary and higher education sector was made explicit in 1997, when the Heads of Government of CARICOM indicated that by the year 2005, 15% of high school graduates (compared with 7% at that time) should be enrolled in tertiary education.

This doubling of tertiary capacity and output over an 8-year period has resulted in a variety of tertiary institutions offering degree and sub-degree programmes. The University of Technology in Jamaica has been established to extend and replace the offerings of the College of Arts, Science and Technology; the Universities of Trinidad and Tobago and of Belize have been founded; there is a University College of the Cayman Islands; the University College of Barbados is expected to begin operation shortly; and the College of the Bahamas is actively considering University status. The expanded provision of tertiary education includes increased involvement of the private sector, as well as of a number of providers external to the region, all of which are in open competition for Caribbean students with the national and regional institutions. These providers may not necessarily acknowledge regional issues or have a regionally oriented curriculum. Advances in information and communication technology have also increased access through distance education using a variety of formats allowing for flexibility in learning 'anywhere, anytime'.

The expansion and modification of the existing tertiary education system to allow for increased enrolment, and the importance of retaining certain established principles which govern how tertiary and higher education ought to be structured and delivered have highlighted issues of relevance and quality. The quality issue is of even greater significance because of the liberalization of 'trade in services', which includes higher education, under the umbrella of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) of the World Trade Organization (WTO). This will promote transnational education and will certainly result in a number of tertiary education service providers seeking a market and finding a home in the Caribbean.

The GATS Agreement and its possible impact are extremely controversial. There is no doubt that the demand for tertiary and higher education is steadily growing, and in the case of the Caribbean this growth exceeds the existing capacity to provide it. It is tempting for governments to see transnational education as the answer to the need for increased tertiary and higher education, as they will not have to fund such education and in addition, the foreign providers often make sizable investments in the country. Students

will also have choices and can exercise their right to select educational opportunities overseas or from external providers operating within national boundaries.

There is need for concern as to whether the potential benefits, principally in terms of economic gain and greater student access counterbalance the possible negative aspects in such areas as quality of education. Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor Hilary Beckles in his report to Council in 2004 on the matter issued a warning that the Caribbean has to be *...concerned with protecting past gains and present achievements from the subversive and corrosive potential of trade liberalization in the higher education sector.*

The existing diversity of institutions and offerings and the possibility of additional ones raise a number of issues which have implications for UWI as it charts its strategic direction in a rapidly changing environment. The UWI, in considering its role in the changed and changing higher education environment, in which it has had a virtual monopoly for over 50 years, has to recognize that there is indeed genuine competition and thus has to reflect on the need for flexibility and change, and the importance of enhanced responsiveness and relevance.

The maintenance of the existing linkages with tertiary institutions, the formation of new relationships and the fostering of internal and external networks are crucial. It is particularly important that UWI consolidate its presence and impact in the NCCs so that there is an effective UWI presence throughout the Caribbean despite the entry of other higher education providers. Failure to do so will be inimical to the principle of regionalism that sustains the University.

Indeed, the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), Belize, the Bahamas, the Cayman Islands as well as the Turks and Caicos Islands, and the British Virgin Islands have developed a modal view of UWI as both engaged in contributing to an understanding of their histories, cultures, societies and economies, and in providing a variety of workshops intended to facilitate regional development, through the School of Continuing Studies (SCS), the Tertiary Level Institutions Unit (TLIU), and Distance Education Centre (UWIDEC). Yet perhaps paradoxically, they are insufficiently connected to the realities of their expanding needs for high quality, affordable and accessible tertiary education services. Each of these countries or territories has increasingly expressed the desire to have a recognizable university presence in place - regional or otherwise.

Partnership with tertiary institutions raises issues of equivalence, credit transfer, articulation, advanced placement and particularly accreditation; all of which relate to both quality on which there should be no compromise, and the assessment of this quality. Calls for accreditation and regulation of the quality of programmes offered in the region have led to the establishment of national accrediting bodies in Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and Barbados; and others are to follow. The regional accreditation of tertiary and higher education institutions and programmes, however, is a priority, especially given the establishment of the Caribbean Single Market and Economy (CSME) which

will permit free movement of graduates across the region. Initiatives in this regard have already been taken by CARICOM and the UWI.

Effective governance and management of the university are vital to the preservation of a responsive, relevant institution of quality. The focus and demand are on both the academic and administrative services offered by the institution. A student-centred / customer service focus must be part of the institution's culture, given the competitive nature of some of the services being offered by other higher education institutions, and the changing nature of student expectations.

Changes in the educational environment are also linked to the possible changes in funding mechanisms. In the face of possible reduced state funding for UWI, the institution has to explore new avenues for sustaining its activities and ensuring a balance between resources spent on research, teaching and outreach activities, all crucial to its survival and the maintenance of quality. The university has to be particularly vigilant in ensuring that adequate attention and resources are given to research to support graduate programmes as well as research to yield new knowledge, inventions and products.

Coming to terms with the demands of an entrepreneurial institution where systems are devised to generate income to feed research and provide funding for resources and programmes is another challenge which must be met. Technology provides an avenue through which UWI can generate income - for example, through developing and offering high quality courses and programmes in Caribbean cultural studies and other high demand areas to the Caribbean Diaspora and to global audiences. The currency and sophistication of the university in terms of its technological capacity and the use of this capacity are important factors in remaining competitive with other institutions.

The University has to have the capacity to respond to these new challenges such as those related to ensuring quality internally and to assist in ensuring quality externally as well as the need for adequate arrangements for sustaining graduate programmes. This capacity has to be reflected in the governance structure

3.2 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Challenges and Threats

3.2.1 Strengths

An examination of the major organs of University governance has to relate to the current situation in which the institution finds itself, although changes may be needed at other levels of the institution to address some of the issues. The Task Force was in many ways cheered by the widespread acknowledgement in its interviews of the multiple strengths of the University. Almost without exception there was recognition of the value of its historical antecedents and there was often passionate declaration of the absolute need to have it remain a regional institution. While there were many opinions of how this might be achieved, there was no doubt of the value to the Caribbean people of a regional institution of higher education and this was not merely an echo of the Grand Anse Declaration. It was felt by many that the founders were wise in establishing a regional

entity and any bright future envisaged for the Caribbean required a regional university. The regional public goods needed in any new Caribbean dispensation could best be provided by a regional university. These goods cannot be produced without the adequate human resources and one of the significant strengths of the University is its highly qualified academic staff, plus a body of well trained administrative and technical professionals.

The UWI brand is one of its strengths and something of which the institution can be proud and failure to market it aggressively enough is a weakness to be corrected. The reputation of and goodwill towards the UWI were high locally and internationally not only because of the quality of the graduates who could be found excelling in many fields, but also because it is still the major institution for research on a wide variety of issues relevant to the many aspects of Caribbean development. Reference was made repeatedly to the number of heads of Caribbean governments and heads of major regional institutions who were graduates. The intellectual output over the years has been significant and perhaps more so in the past has been a reference point for much of the early Caribbean nation building.

UWI is one of only two truly regional universities in the world supported by several sovereign governments. The University of the South Pacific is the other similar regional tertiary education institution and the Task Force analysed very carefully its mode of functioning to determine if there were any relevant lessons to be learnt. It is a source of strength in these institutions that the administrative structure admits of a single Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, emphasising again the unitary nature of the institution.

In spite of the plethora of institutions in the Caribbean that offer tertiary education, there is no doubt that the UWI is the recognized leader in the field as reflected in the frequency with which it is called upon to advise on regional matters. The CARICOM Heads of Government acknowledged in 2001 that UWI will be the first port of call for advice.

UWI must also never ignore the strength that lies in the physical beauty of the Caribbean and particularly in its main campuses. Part of the attraction and the nostalgia evoked in its staff and alumni derive from the memories of the physical aspect of the surroundings.

3.2.2 Weaknesses

Every institution must have weaknesses which are often the obverse of the strengths. But it was a source of some satisfaction to the Task Force, and must be a tribute to the previous restructuring exercise that there was not the sense of crisis in the institution which seemed to exist in 1994 as reflected in that Report. The main source of actual and potential weakness in UWI is the instability of funding and the heavy dependence on governments for core support. The Caribbean economies with few exceptions are fragile and this has to be a source of concern for any regional institution that depends so heavily on the public purse. The UWI also has to confront the reality that governments which fund the institution will wish to exercise control, if only in the sense

of seeking responses to their immediate development needs and a supra national posture for a regional institution is therefore a potential source of weakness. Institutional prosperity and sustainability demand that UWI understands the difference between influence and control by governments. Our sense is that governments were more interested in the former than the latter

Several of our respondents referred to the current funding arrangements as contributing to a possible increased independence of the campuses and therefore a powerful centrifugal or fissiparous force that militates against a strong regional institution and may indeed induce inter-campus competition beyond that which is a healthy rivalry. The growth of the campuses, supported as they are mainly by the host government has meant that they are populated by an overwhelming majority of students native to that country. This phenomenon is aggravated by the duplication of programmes across the campuses. This is a weakness in the current arrangement that militates against the creation of the Caribbean identity that is even more needed today. The student-centredness which is often asserted as a basic principle to undergird much of what the UWI does should focus not only on the needs of students in their local environment, but also on promoting their movement within the Caribbean. But more importantly was the almost universal perception that the university was not doing well by the countries that did not have a campus. The fear was often expressed that the failure to engage more actively the so-called 'non-campus countries' and have a more visible presence there was one of the major threats to the reality of a regional institution.

The area of communications is a marked weakness, and the UWI has to promote a more active engagement with its various publics, both governmental and non-governmental. One Minister indicated that the university was one of the region's best kept secrets and there was no appreciation of the need to market what the university does and what it stands for. Another signaled the difficulties students had in negotiating through the university's electronic systems for pertinent information.

The weakness in communication is evidenced by the deficiencies in its public relations. The University can no longer base a communication strategy on the myth that it will almost as a matter of right be the preferred option for higher education in the Caribbean. It has not taken advantage of the more modern information technologies which are now standard in the majority of universities – at least those with which Caribbean institutions are compared. The content and frequency of updating of its website left much to be desired and even in its present form did little to convey the impression of a regional institution.

The Task Force noted that there were now excellent publications/magazines from the various campuses, and welcomed the information from the Vice-Chancellor that there would soon be a similar publication from the university as a whole. The mechanism by which the University keeps all of its personnel informed of important events on a regular basis needs to be strengthened. There are now campus electronic newsletters at Mona, St. Augustine and Cave Hill, but there is nothing similar for the NCCs. It is not enough to presume that the general public will access the university's website for information about

important events in the life of the institution. The possibility of a university newspaper or some similar method of communicating with the public, both internal as well as external has been raised. Radio Mona has an excellent reputation in Jamaica, but does not have a significant presence elsewhere.

It was pointed out by several persons that the UWI has not fully explored the great potential that exists for distance education. Our observation is that the internal communication leaves much to be desired. Communication among the various University Centres and Campuses as well as with the Central administration is not adequate for the functioning of a regional institution.

The area of alumni relations was frequently cited as a weakness. Over the past few years under the leadership of Vice-Chancellor Rex Nettleford and Pro Vice-Chancellor Marlene Hamilton, the University has expended considerable effort in mobilizing its alumni and putting in place a structure to facilitate communication with them. The creation of the various intra- and extra-Caribbean chapters and the modification of the relevant *Statutes* to give effect to an enhanced role for the alumni have been very positive. It has been recognized that there is still a large untapped potential for the alumni to play a more significant role in the institution but as one Minister emphasised, the loyalty of alumni has to be created on the foundation of a good experience as a student. The *Charter* recognizes the Guild of Graduates (now known as the UWI Alumni Association) as one of the authorities of the university and this should be reflected in its involvement in terms of participation both financially and otherwise as is the practice in many other prestigious universities both private and state supported. The limitations in mobilising the alumni must be seen as part of the weakness in general in attracting the attention of the Caribbean Diaspora as a force for the support to the university.

The UWI has grown rapidly in the recent past in terms of student enrollment without an accompanying increase in the necessary resources and this must represent a strain at all levels. There is also the problem of the relative under-funding of the Centre's activities to carry out its mandate in quality assurance, research and service to the NCCs.

3.2.3 Opportunities, Challenges and Threats

There is much in the external environment that represents both opportunity and threat to the UWI. There is the perception that the renewed thrust towards regionalism represents a golden opportunity for the UWI to impact on this new phase of nation building and cast itself as the first port of call for advice and expertise on things Caribbean. There is much to be done at the analytical level to advance the CSME and the UWI has the talents to provide the analyses and policy frameworks to do so. There is also a great opportunity for the university to explore academic partnerships within and outside of the Caribbean. The presence of a large Caribbean Diaspora may facilitate the establishment of such partnerships and the governance structure should facilitate them.

The fact that the Caribbean is far distant from the ideal level of enrollment of its eligible cohort in tertiary education represents both a challenge and an opportunity for UWI. The challenge is for the UWI not to think of providing all the educational opportunities, but to assist in developing the appropriate architecture of Caribbean tertiary education. The evident wish of several of the TLI's for closer association with UWI and the persistent call by the Ministers of Education for the UWI to examine the state of higher education in the region indicates a present opportunity.

But it is this thirst for higher education that poses a threat for the UWI as well. There has been an explosion of offerings in this field in the Caribbean and the advent of the WTO/GATS agreements with the possibility of liberalization of higher education services must represent a possible threat to the regional university as has been referred to previously. The UWI has pressed the debate on this issue to the level of the Heads of Government with the expectation that the eventual decisions of the governments will not be prejudicial to their support of a regional university. There is a legitimate effort by countries to expand their national tertiary institutions and this will pose a threat to the UWI unless it adopts the posture that the correct approach is to facilitate the growth of these institutions with the knowledge that UWI cannot and should not attempt to satisfy all the needs for higher education in the region.

But perhaps the greatest threat to the preservation of the university as a regional institution is its approach to its relations with the non-campus countries. It was a constant refrain heard both in those countries and outside, that the University had to make itself more relevant to the needs of these countries. The establishment of a Board or the appointment of a Pro Vice-Chancellor to oversee their interests was not enough and there was constant complaint that the needs of these countries were seen as secondary to those of the larger ones. There was persistent concern that the university presence in these countries was inadequate and the educational opportunities offered were not addressed or monitored with the same care as were those in the major campuses. The fact that these countries are being offered educational opportunities for their students at non-UWI institutions with limited financial responsibility for the host country often makes the UWI a secondary option. Indeed, off-shore universities have been developing strong competitive positions, including articulation with local institutions, with the active encouragement of governments. UWI has not been able to translate its long-established regional role into equally strong inter-institutional relationships with local TLIs. Regional governments are systematically engaged in merging their tertiary learning institutions into community colleges, university colleges, and universities.

It is worth noting again that the 1994 Report assigned a strategic role to the University Centre, yet charged it with addressing the needs of the NCCs. This has sometimes created a managerial dilemma, since the latter functions implied that the Centre must assume, directly or indirectly some considerable operational responsibility for university programmes in those countries.

The UWI must always bear in mind that it exists in an area that is prone to natural disasters and be prepared to make itself “disaster proof”. This however may also provide another opportunity for it to mobilize the expertise it has in various disciplines to be put at the disposal of Caribbean countries to mitigate the impact of the disaster or to speed the recovery post-disaster.

SECTION 4: THE GOVERNANCE OF THE MAIN UNIVERSITY BODIES

The initial terms of reference contemplated examination of the Council and its major committees, but it soon became obvious that it was critical to review also the role and functioning of the major decision-making bodies of the University, including the three Boards that had been instituted as a result of the 1994 Report. The Task Force therefore directed its attention to the following major organs of the University:

- The Council and its committees, the Finance and General Purposes Committee and the University Strategy Committee
- The Campus Councils and their Finance and General Purposes Committees
- The Board for Undergraduate Studies
- The Board for Graduate Studies and Research and The Graduate School
- The Board for Non-Campus Countries and Distance Education.
- The Senate

4.1 The University Council

Statute 20 assigns to the Council a “generality of powers”, but in addition makes specific mention of certain ones which deal essentially with virtually all financial and academic aspects of the institution’s life. Only Council can make or amend Statutes. All other functions can be delegated to other bodies, but there are some for which, in practice, Council retains exclusive responsibility. These include:

- conferring Emeritus status on Chancellors and Vice-Chancellors;
- determining tuition and examination fees;
- selecting a seal, arms and a mace;
- appointing the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and senior staff.

Delegation of powers set out in *Statute 21* cannot be revoked except by other *Statutes*.

The current membership which serves these functions is comprised of persons from a wide range of interests representing the University and its staff, the contributing countries, the alumni, the students and the general public. The membership totals sixty-two (62) and comprises:

- The Chancellor as Chair
- The Vice-Chancellor
- The three (3) Campus Council chairs
- The Pro Vice-Chancellors
- The three (3) Campus Principals
- The University Registrar
- Representatives of the university academic community
- The Guild of Graduates

- Representatives of the governments of the contributing countries
- The TLIs
- Students
- Representatives of the NCCs
- Senior administrative and professional staff
- Administrative, technical and service staff, and
- Ten (10) persons from the lay public nominated by the Chancellor.

Statute 18 includes:

- The Pro-Chancellor, as well as
- The Treasurer.

The 1994 Report recommended that Council should meet “...*more frequently than once a year so that it can play the significant policy and directional role, which its terms of reference and powers imply*”. However, this has not been the recent practice.

The Task Force examined several of the documents of previous meetings of Council and received numerous comments from a wide range of interests about the manner in which Council functions and should function. It was clear that there had been occasions when Council had functioned brilliantly, exercising its powers fully, and much of the stability and progress of the university was due to the influence of Council at critical points in its history. The manner in which Council had addressed the recommendations of the 1994 Commission and had made the sweeping changes in the structure of the university was a good example.

However, there was almost unanimity that Council was not always serving the role as envisaged for it by the 1994 Commission and indeed had from time to time become reactive rather than proactive and bogged down in formalities, receiving reports and not providing the forum for debate on the larger issues. The universal comment was that Council was too large to be an effective forum for discussion and debate about policy, and in addition was not being served appropriately by the Strategy Committee which should have been providing the basis for much of that discussion and debate. Furthermore, there was the common perception that the discharge of its major policy making function, being a forum for debate and projecting the University to the public could be also achieved by regulation of the agenda and restriction of much of the documentation presented to Council.

The Task Force was seised of the dilemma of ensuring participation from the major stakeholders and at the same time having a body that was small enough to facilitate the exercise of its essential functions. The Task Force considered two options. First, that Council should remain as it is currently constituted and would function more as a “general assembly”, exercising its formal role and a few unique functions such as the appointment of the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor. There would be an Executive Committee of Council which would meet more regularly than once per year.

However, without prejudice to the powers of Council as set out in *Statute 20*, the Task Force took careful note of the role envisaged for Council in the 1994 Commission's Report and considered that Council should:

- Exercise its responsibility of guarding the interest of the stakeholders in the university
- Be a major instrument for preserving the regional character of the university
- Approve the vision, mission, strategic plans and annual budgets of the university
- Put in place suitable arrangements for evaluating the performance of senior staff
- Ensure the establishment of monitoring and controls of fiscal and programmatic operations
- Monitor the institutional performance against the plans and where appropriate, benchmark performance against other similar institutions.

If Council was to exercise these functions fully, then a second option should be considered. **The second option, which is the one favoured, is that Council should remain the major policy-making forum in the university but its composition and functioning should be revised, bearing in mind the need to maintain the interests of all the key stakeholders.**

The Task Force recommends that:

- There be no changes to the powers of Council as set out in *Statute 20*
- The representation of the contributing countries should be maintained, but there should be reductions of the nominees in most of the other categories while still retaining adequate representation of the key stakeholders;
- The Agendas of its meetings should be structured and documentation presented in a timely manner to ensure that it fulfilled its role as the major policy body of the institution;
- Council should elaborate and promulgate a Statement of its Primary Responsibilities
- The post of Treasurer should be formally abolished. It was never established
- The post of Pro-Chancellor should be formally abolished
- The size of the Council should be reduced and the composition should be as follows:
 - Chancellor - Chair
 - Vice-Chancellor
 - Campus Principals (3)
 - Chairs of the Campus Councils (3)
 - University Registrar (1)
 - University Bursar (1)
 - Chairs of the Boards (3)
 - Representatives of governments of contributing countries (15)
 - Chancellor's nominees (5) ***N.B: to be rotated on a 3-yearly basis***
 - Representatives of Academic Boards (4)
 - Chair of Committee of Deans (1)

- Representative of the Assoc. of Caribbean Tertiary Institutions (ACTI) (1)
 - Alumni representatives (2)
 - Guild of Students (3)
 - Representative of Senior Administrative & Professional Staff (1)
 - Representative of the Administrative, Technical & Service Staff (1)
- The Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor would invite members of staff to serve in advisory capacity as necessary.

4.1.1 Finance and General Purposes Committee (F&GPC)

The F&GPC is established by *Ordinance 9* as a Standing Committee of the Council. Its statutory mandate is to exercise, in between the meetings of the Council, all the powers of the Council with respect to the receipt and expenditure of money, as well as all other powers of Council not otherwise specifically delegated. F&GPC is required to meet at least twice per year and to report on its operations to the Annual Business Meeting of Council.

The prescribed membership of F&GPC reflects representation from three categories of stakeholders - the University community, the contributing governments and civil society. The University representatives are: the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro Vice-Chancellors, the Campus Principals, the Deputy Campus Principals, the University Bursar, three (3) members of the academic staff nominated by the Vice-Chancellor - one of whom must be a member of staff below professorial rank, three (3) student members of the Council, and a representative of the Guild of Graduates (now known as the UWI Alumni Association). The contributing countries that have campuses each have a representative while those contributing countries without campuses have three representatives, selected on a rotational basis. Civil society is represented by three (3) persons, each of whom is selected by a Campus Council. The total membership is twenty-six (26) persons, seventeen (17) of whom are members of the University. Eight (8) persons constitute a quorum.

The Vice-Chancellor is the chairman of F&GPC, by virtue of *Statute 5.5(a)*; and under *Ordinance 9*, the University Registrar is the Secretary.

The tenure of persons selected by the Campus Councils is two years with eligibility for renewal of membership. Representatives of the academic staff and the Guild of Graduates enjoy membership of F&GPC for one year, with eligibility for re-appointment, while the student representatives are members for the year in which they are elected by the Council of the Guild of Students to be their representatives on the University Council.

The 1994 Report had recommended the retention of F&GPC; but, (as the Report also urged in relation to Council) with an enhanced lay membership, including members of the private sector and the professions. This was seen as important, bearing in mind the University's role in regional development. It was also regarded as a way "to open up channels of communication to the private sector and assist the University in its interface

with the external world”. The Report further recommended that the post of Treasurer should be filled and that the Treasurer, not the Vice-Chancellor, should be the ex officio chairman of F&GPC. The view was that the Treasurer would be expected to be an important independent voice in negotiations with governments and other bodies about University funding. However, as noted above, the post was never filled and the recommendation of the Task Force is that it should be abolished.

At the time of the Governance Report, the total membership of F&GPC was 41. The reduction in membership to the current 26 was achieved by the removal of University Deans of Faculties and a decrease in the level of government representation. The Vice-Chancellor remains the chairman, as the Commission’s recommendation with respect to the role of the Treasurer in particular, and the Treasurer’s leadership of this Committee was not accepted.

The Task Force learned that F&GPC customarily meets three (3) times per year. A review by the Task Force of a selection of Agendas and Minutes relating to F&GPC’s work indicates that it performs its statutory functions. However, in written and oral submissions to the Task Force concerns were expressed about the functions and composition of this Committee. In terms that were reminiscent of the recommendation of the 1994 Report, some respondents urged that the composition of the Committee should be strengthened by more lay members from the industrial and commercial sectors. There was also the view that, as was the case with the other main university committees, the countries without campuses were under-represented on this Committee at the level of governments and that the University representation was too “campus focused”. Broader representation from these countries was seen as critical to strengthening the University’s regional influence and relevance.

The Task Force understood that given the realities of management and the fact that there are various Boards exercising functions and taking decisions on different aspects of the University’s operations, some matters will rightly come to F&GPC meetings for noting only. But the operation of a complex organization like the University necessarily involves non-routine matters, many of which have serious financial and other implications, therefore warranting rigorous examination and discussion. Inhibiting factors in this regard are a pattern of poor attendance by some members and the fact that members often do not receive, in good time, papers relevant to items on meeting Agendas.

Given the infrequency with which Council meets (usually only once per year) F&GPC is intended to be its effective surrogate in the ongoing management of the fiscal and general affairs of the University. It is, therefore, a matter of some concern that F&GPC does not seem to be a robust forum for critical thinking and serious engagement about the University’s fiscal and general business. It may well be that if meetings of F&GPC were to provide opportunities for informed debate and decision-making, attendance might improve.

The Task Force also considered the relationship between F&GPC and the Campus F&GPCs. The expectation was that some organic link would be discernible between the

matters of concerns to F&GPC at the Centre and those at F&GPC at the campus level. We did not find such a link, but accepted that this might be due to difficulty in tracking issues, given the differences in the cycle of meetings at both Centre and campus levels. The apparent lack of connection may be an example of the disconnect between the affairs of the University at the Centre and on the Campuses, and may indicate the work that must be done to devise structures and processes to promote and sustain the notion of a single institution having a regional remit.

It was suggested to the Task Force that the Committee should be split into separate Committees - one for Finance and another for General Purposes - for the reason that the “Finance” aspect of the Committee’s mandate required more focused attention than it is currently receiving. Also, doubts were expressed as to whether the expertise to evaluate critically and to give advice on the University’s financial matters resided in the membership of the Committee as currently constituted. **The Task Force is not persuaded that two separate Committees are necessary for the functions to be performed effectively.**

Aware of the desire not to have large unwieldy committees, the Task Force saw value in reconsidering the membership of F&GPC to include persons from the private sector with training and expertise in finance.

The Task Force recommends that:

- The category in *Clause 5(g)* of *Ordinance 9* should be eliminated and replaced by the following:
 - Three (3) persons from the general public with expertise in financial matters to be nominated by the Chancellor;
- The Agendas must be constructed to allow the Committee to perform its statutory functions.
- The Minutes should be summarised for presentation at Campus F&GPC so that matters arising from these minutes can be considered.

4.1.2 University Strategy Committee

The University Strategy Committee (the Strategy Committee) is established under *Ordinance 10* as a Standing Committee of both the Council and the Senate. It was expressly established to “*function as the crucial policy-making mechanism of the Council with responsibility primarily for strategy and monitoring its implementation of policy adopted by Council*”.

In addition, under statutory delegation of the powers of the Senate, the Council and the Campus Councils, the Strategy Committee is charged with the responsibility of prescribing the units of learning or research and the subjects of study that should form part, or be the responsibility of each Faculty and also of determining whether such units or subjects should be the responsibility of more than one Faculty. The Strategy Committee is also authorized to exercise Senate’s power to submit to the Council estimates of expenditure relating to the work of the university.

As in the case of the other major organs of governance, membership of the Strategy Committee comprises three (3) categories of persons - University representatives, government representatives, and representatives from the wider society. University representatives are: the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro Vice-Chancellors, the Campus Principals, the Chairs of the Campus Councils, members of the Academic Board of each Campus, representatives of undergraduate students, post-graduate students and alumni, respectively. The Chancellor, by virtue of office, has the right to attend and participate in the meetings of the Strategy Committee. Government representatives are selected by the Council from among its members, being three (3) persons to represent the governments of countries with campuses and three (3) persons to represent the governments of countries without campuses. Two (2) persons who are members of the wider society are nominated by the Chancellor.

Total membership of the Strategy Committee is 23. Nine (9) members, including the Vice-Chancellor constitute a quorum. By virtue of *Statute 5.5(a)*, the Vice-Chancellor is the chairman of the Strategy Committee.

Members, other than the Vice-Chancellor, Chairs of Campus Councils, and the Campus Principals, serve for 3 years.

The establishment of the Strategy Committee was a recommendation of the 1994 Commission's Report. The Report envisaged that the Committee would bring together both academic and financial planning, although it stressed that the Committee should concentrate on strategy rather than on detailed planning. Recognizing a key role of the University in regional development, the Commission saw the Strategy Committee as having a prime responsibility for ensuring that this role remained a priority in the University's operations.

The consensus of opinion was that the Committee was not carrying out its primary function and had not lived up to expectations. As one respondent put it, the Strategy Committee had "lost its way". It was pointed out that there was indeed no locus in the University for institution-wide planning. This was a serious deficiency if the institution was to adhere to the accepted cycle; that is, policy, strategy, planning and budgeting, then evaluation leading again to policy.

The Task Force heard that apart from the first meeting in which significant discussions were held on the University's strategic direction and objectives, meetings of the Strategy Committee had fallen into a pattern of operation that made them indistinguishable from the meetings of any of the other main organs. Examination of a selection of the Committee's Agendas and Minutes led to the same conclusion. There were issues of strategic importance before the Committee but there were also several agenda items which had no strategic relevance and could serve only to deflect the attention of the Committee from its core functions.

With respect to the composition of the membership, a question was raised as to whether this was a forum in which Ministers of Government should participate most usefully, given that the Committee was essentially a technical one. There was a view that personnel from the University Centres without campuses should have representation as part of the thrust to foster a regional approach and to ensure that adequate attention was being paid to the needs and concerns of those countries.

Another area of concern was the scheduling of the Strategy Committee meetings. The Task Force heard that, invariably, Strategy Committee meetings were held the day before the Annual Business Meeting of Council and that the time-tabling of the meetings in this way was a deliberate cost-saving device as several individuals had membership on both Committees. The Task Force concurred with the views expressed by many who were interviewed that the business of the Strategy Committee cannot be effectively dealt with if discussions have to be hurried in order to have a report ready for the Council the next day.

A fundamental question has arisen as to whether the Strategy Committee is needed at all and whether the development of strategy should not be part of the remit of F&GPC. The prevailing view however was that strategic planning and the subsequent monitoring and evaluation of the strategic plan approved by Council calls for the kinds of inputs that could not be made by F&GPC, especially given its other functions. It was also suggested that periodic retreats focused on strategic matters with key stakeholder participation could be an alternative to this Standing Committee. The Task Force is of the view that this approach has merit, but does not replace the functions which a Strategy Committee should perform. The Strategy Committee could be made to work effectively if its membership were appropriate, if it maintained its focus as a body concerned primarily with strategy, and if it organised itself (in terms of its agendas, meeting schedules, and the timely distribution of papers) to perform effectively. Strategic planning retreats would then be ancillary to, rather than in place of, the Committee.

The Task Force recommends that:

- The Strategy Committee should be renamed the “Strategy and Planning Committee”
- The functions of the Committee should be clearly defined to include those set out in *Ordinance 10, Clause 5*; advising on the university’s planning operations and functions; evaluating the university’s Strategic Plan for presentation to Council; evaluating the budgetary implications and monitoring the Plan against its Key Performance Indicators
- The strategic planning function in the office of the Vice-Chancellor should be strengthened considerably to allow for enhanced input into and rationalisation of the plans being made at various places in the university and rationalisation of the use of the institution’s resources and exploitation of synergies as they occur
- *Ordinance 10, Clause 2* should be modified given that University Council is to be the major forum for making university policy

- The Committee should meet with sufficient frequency to discharge its functions and in advance of the Annual Business Meeting of Council to allow for adequate input into the discussions at University Council
- The composition of the Committee should be as follows:
 - Vice-Chancellor
 - Chairs of the Boards (3)
 - Campus Principals (3)
 - University Registrar (1)
 - University Bursar (1)
 - Representatives of Academic Board (4)
 - Chair of the Committee of Deans (1)
 - Alumnus representative (1)
 - Student representative (1)
 - Chancellor’s nominees (3) ***N.B: to be persons with relevant expertise***
 - Head of University Strategic Planning Unit (1)

4.2 Campus Councils and Campus F&GPCs

4.2.1 Campus Councils

The Campus Councils are established by *Statute 19* and their powers set out in *Statute 21*. The prescribed membership is 21, drawn from the academic community, representatives of the host government, of the NCCs, of the TLIs in the Caribbean, of the Guild of Graduates, students, the administrative, technical and service staff, Deans and lay members appointed by the Chancellor. The Chair of the Council is appointed by the Chancellor.

The senior university members retain membership by virtue of their office, the government representatives are at the discretion of their governments, while other members have a term of one year in office.

The creation of Campus Councils was a recognition of the need to give greater autonomy and flexibility to each Campus to facilitate their creative and timely response to serving the particular needs of that Campus. This is done frequently in relation to the perceived developmental needs of the host country, but also in consideration of the need for coherence with, and responsiveness to, expectations of the regional university. The strength of this arrangement sometimes carries a linked weakness of ignoring or diverging from that very regional coherence of the university. The 1994 Report had stressed the role of the Campus Councils in “***taking over a much larger function in the running of their own campuses***”. The Campus Council offers the potential to be a useful forum for both solid accountability of the leadership of the campus and meaningful participation of persons external to the campus in the policy determination for that campus. If properly utilised, it can engage genuinely in the developmental and policy issues and challenges of the campus. If not, it runs the real risk of becoming a sterile formality where reports are politely noted and transmitted to Council. Several submissions emphasised that this risk was a reality in some cases.

There was a variety of views on the need for and the degree to which the Campus Councils functioned as intended and discharged their powers as set out in *Statute 21*. At least two government ministerial representatives have indicated their desire to see this forum continue to allow their close participation in, and familiarity with, the operations of their respective campuses. However, at least one other government minister expressed the view that the important issue was that there should be a forum at Campus level to allow government input and such a forum could be a merged Campus Council and F&GPC. Other submissions also referred to the apparent duplication of roles and functions between Campus Council and F&GPC and suggested that the two entities be merged. The student representatives complained of their feeling of exclusion, since although they are members, they receive papers late and lack the financial expertise to properly assess some of the critical agenda items. They argue for more such expertise on the body.

It was noted that too few of the members external to the campus attend regularly or participate in the meetings. This includes even the Government Ministers of the host country at times, thereby reducing the value of the forum for genuine participation of various stakeholders in the decision-making process, and tending to weaken the opportunity for strong accountability.

Analysis of the Agendas and Minutes of the Councils showed some variation from campus to campus, but the general impression was that the Councils were not functioning as policy bodies, but served principally to receive reports. There seemed to be no organic link between the University Council and the Campus Councils, and rarely were issues from the former debated or discussed in the latter and vice versa. *Statute 21.1(k)* cites among the powers of the Campus Council “**To receive from the Academic Board of its campus estimates of expenditure required to carry out the work of the University at its Campus and on behalf of the Council to provide the requisite money in so far as the estimates are approved and accepted by the Campus Council**”. The question may be raised as to whether it is Academic Board that should generate the proposed estimates (a requirement that seems to be generally breached). Academic Boards have tended to focus on academic issues, leaving the primary financial matters to Campus F&GPC, which functions on behalf of Campus Council.

Attention was drawn to *Statute 21.1(n)* “**To recommend to the Senate and Council ...the institution..... of Fellowships, Studentships, Scholarships, Exhibitions, Bursaries, Prizes and other aids to study or research for its campus**”. The matter of these awards seems much less weighty than other powers delegated to the Campus Council from those bodies, and it would seem logical and more efficient (and consistent with practice) to delegate these campus awards fully to the Campus Council.

The Task Force was persuaded that the Campus Councils and the Campus F&GPCs should remain as separate bodies.

The Task Force recommends that:

- The functions should remain as outlined in *Statute 21*, but the Task Force has taken note of Campus Council's decision with respect to *Clause 1(k)*
- The membership of the Campus Councils should remain as currently established, but every deliberate effort must be made to include representation from the NCCs under *Clauses 1(h) of Statute 19*
- *Statute 21*, relating to the Powers of Campus Council be amended such that:
 - a) the campus estimates should be generated by the Campus F&GPC to be presented to the University Council; and
 - b) the financial matters pertaining to Fellowships, etc. that are campus specific be delegated fully to the Campus Council

4.2.2 Campus F&GPCs

Ordinance 25 establishes the membership of the Campus F&GPC as well as its powers, which in essence are identical to those of the Campus Council for which it acts in between meetings of the Campus Council. Campus Councils implicitly would meet at least annually, although special meetings can be called. Since the business entrusted to the Campus Councils is ongoing, there is need for a body to act on its behalf between Campus Council meetings so as to cover the many decision-making needs in a timely way. The *Ordinance* speaks to meetings at least four times per year, but more frequent meetings are desirable given the volume of significant issues and decisions that call for participation of the broad composition of this body.

The membership, set out in *Ordinance 25.5*, is slightly fewer than the full Campus Council and covers all the main stakeholders as for Campus Councils.

It is noteworthy that the 1994 Report made no specific mention of the Campus F&GPCs, perhaps assuming that their functions would evolve logically from those of the Campus Councils. It is possible that the complete replication of the University Committees at campus level had relevance and importance at the time the new structure was developed in 1984, but it is also possible that this has had the effect of promoting the fissiparous tendency referred to before.

Analysis of the Agendas and Minutes of these bodies showed that there was considerable variation from campus to campus in the frequency of meeting and the nature of the issues discussed. It was striking however, that there seemed to be little organic relationship between the Campus and University bodies with this name. In one instance a Campus F&GPC has exceeded its mandate and determined fees for some programmes, a function which is the exclusive province of the University Council. Submissions spoke to the practice of a Campus Management Team which appeared to be a very useful mechanism for dealing with the many routine administrative issues that arise. It is assumed that this does not supplant the role of the formal committees.

The Task Force heard that few members external to the campus attend regularly and in some instances there is irregularity of meeting schedules, which perhaps contributes to the problems of attendance. This is unfortunate, since the whole premise of

the Committee is that decisions would have the full participation of persons external to the campus as well as of the campus leadership, otherwise it becomes incestuous and encourages possible lowering of standards of accountability.

The Task Force was sensitive to the need for student-centeredness in all of the university's operations and should wish to see the concern of the students dealt with in a substantive way in the Campus F&GPCs.

The Task Force recommends that:

- The functions should remain as set out in the *Ordinance*
- The Campus F&GPCs remain as bodies which relate to the Campus Councils in the same manner as the University F&GPC relates to the University Council
- The meetings of the Campus F&GPC must be formalised and calendarised
- The membership of the Committee should be as set out in *Ordinance 25*
- A representative of the Office of Student Services should be in attendance at meetings.

4.3 The University Boards

4.3.1 Board for Undergraduate Studies (BUS)

Statute 28 assigns to the BUS the responsibility for “*managing the process of monitoring the quality of programmes for first degrees, certificates and diplomas other than diplomas designated as advanced diplomas*”.

In addition, by way of delegation from Senate, the Board exercises a number of the specific powers outlined in *Statute 25* (Powers of the Senate) in so far as those relate to undergraduate studies. These include in the main: serving as the academic authority for the university and having the control and general direction of instruction and examinations and of the award of Degrees, Diplomas, Certificates and other distinctions, other than Honorary Degrees; determining the academic policy of the university; making, after report from the Faculties concerned, regulations relating to courses of study and examinations; regulating, subject to the *Statutes* and *Ordinances*, the admission, continuance or discontinuance of students in relation to courses of study and the conditions for qualifying for admission to the various titles, degrees, distinctions and other awards offered by the university; formulating, modifying or revising, subject to the control of Council, schemes for the organisation of Faculties, Schools, Institutes, Departments, Divisions, Centres, or other units of learning of the University, and assigning to them their respective subjects, and reporting to the Council on the expediency of establishing other such units of learning, or of abolishing, combining or subdividing any of them; having general authority over any acts of those units. In addition, the Board is empowered to have general responsibility for regulating the management of financial awards and prizes and for the library services of the university.

The Board also, by delegation from Senate, exercises Senate's powers as laid out in *Statutes 46 and 47* regarding the requirements to be fulfilled for matriculation to and graduation from the university, in so far as those pertain to undergraduate programmes.

The 15 members of the Board as stipulated in *Statute 28* comprise a Pro Vice-Chancellor as chair, the Vice-Chancellor or nominee, three representatives from each Academic Board, a representative of the Guild of Students on each Campus and a representative of the Guild of Graduates (now known as the Alumni Association) of the university.

The Report of the 1994 Commission recommended that the prime responsibility for all first degree and sub-degree matters (save in relation to those programmes that served the entire region) should be devolved to the Academic Boards of the three campuses, while the Centre's major role should be to provide for quality assessment and control. The central function of the BUS was therefore recommended to be that of managing the quality control process.

The recommendations arising from the 1994 Commission on Governance Implementation Committee's Report provided a more detailed interpretation of the Board's remit which included central control over general academic policy guidelines and the responsibility for all aspects of quality audit and assurance in relation to undergraduate and sub-degree programmes and for quality reviews of taught postgraduate courses and distance teaching. In addition, the Committee stipulated that the Board should be responsible for the preservation of regionality. Though that concept was not specifically defined, several strategies were recommended to promote maintenance of standards across campuses and important cross- and inter-campus academic dialogue. It is clear that the preservation of regionality cannot be the responsibility of one entity and one section of this report outlines some of the measures that should contribute to such regionality.

The Task Force received an in-depth analysis of the extent to which the Board's statutory obligations were being met and of specific initiatives undertaken by the Office of the Board for Undergraduate Studies (OBUS) to fulfill the mission and objectives that had been identified for it in 2002 as part of the strategic planning exercise undertaken in the context of the "UWI Strategic Plan II: 2002-2007". The Task Force also reviewed a variety of other relevant documents and received written and oral comments on the functioning of the Board from a wide range of respondents.

Evidence from these varied sources suggested that this Board was functioning well, that its work was important to the university and that it was achieving considerable success in fulfilling its mandate. The analysis provided and the comments received revealed that commendable progress had been achieved in the monitoring of quality, both in respect of the review of individual departments and in the developmental activities that supported this process. Further, a number of important changes had been introduced in the academic policies of the university to reflect current international practice as well the present realities of the regional higher education environment, and to influence in

productive ways the university's responses to this and to its evolving relations with other tertiary institutions.

A number of weaknesses were identified, however, that militated against the optimal functioning of the Board. These resulted in part from certain aspects of the provisions of the *Statute* and from expectations of the Board that could not be realised because the necessary resources were not available. Further, it was emphasised that while the Board formulated policies, responsibility for implementation rested with the campuses, and the Board did not always have adequate resources to ensure that that implementation was effected. An example of this last was the extent to which the implementation of the foundation courses could not be effected appropriately because of lack of resources.

Elements of *Statute 28* that contributed to this situation included the following: in the composition of the Board there was no specific provision for representation of Deans, or of senior campus administrators who could be responsible for ensuring that implementation of policies or recommended quality assurance activities occurred. It was noted, too, that Academic Board representatives did not always see themselves as representing the views of their Academic Boards but rather reflected their own or their department's perspectives, and while BUS's statutory powers allowed for direct linkages to various campus-based academic units on matters of policy, there was no requirement for reference to Campus Academic Boards on such matters. Moreover, the *Statute* did not allow for the BUS to advise Council on the provision of facilities and resources. This made it difficult to insist upon implementation of policies for which necessary additional resources were not available.

Other issues identified as needing clarification included the fact that while in the Commission on Governance Implementation Committee's Report BUS had been assigned responsibility for the preservation of regionality, neither the responsibility nor the mechanisms deemed necessary to achieve this was included in the *Statute*. In addition, responsibility for library services was included in the statutory responsibilities of all three Boards (BUS, BGSR and BNCC&DE), so that it was not clear which of these bodies should assume major responsibility for overseeing this work. It was noted that in practice, library services were at present being managed by the Office of Administration and Special Initiatives (OASIs); that function having been retained by the former chair of BUS who was now responsible for that office. Similar lack of clarity existed in relation to the responsibility for the management of regional scholarship awards, assigned by *Statute* to BUS, though some were managed by OASIs.

In order to strengthen further the valuable work being done by the Board for Undergraduate Studies;

The Task Force recommends that:

- The functions of the Board remain the same as in *Statute 28*, but notes that *Clause 3* be amended to reflect the Board's responsibility for assessing the process

- The membership of the Board at *Statute 28, Clause 1(c)* should include the Deputy Principal of each campus, two (2) representatives of each Academic Board one of whom must be a Dean and the Chair of the Committee of Deans
- The Board recommend to Campus F&GPCs the resources needed to implement recommended policy or quality assurance initiatives
- Formal budgetary provision should be made for those mechanisms (such as staff mobility across campuses) deemed necessary to preserve the regional character of the university's work
- The responsibility for library services which has been delegated to three Boards be fixed in the Board for Undergraduate Studies in the exercise of which there will be appropriate consultation

4.3.2 Board for Graduate Studies and Research (The Graduate School)

The Report of the 1994 Commission on Governance stressed the importance of enhancing the University's work in postgraduate studies and research in order for the UWI to provide a further critical contribution to regional development, to ensure its standing and reputation in the international arena, and to attract its best graduates to remain to pursue research and postgraduate studies at UWI rather than abroad. The Commission held therefore that the Centre should play an enhanced role in this area and judged that the University needed a Graduate School to drive the process by coordinating the efforts being undertaken in various units and to promote and monitor the quality of such endeavours. The Commission further recommended that the Graduate School be governed by a Board for Graduate Studies and Research (BGSR), chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School who would enjoy the status of a Pro Vice-Chancellor.

Statute 30 formally establishes the School for Graduate Studies & Research and the Board. The *Statute* outlines the composition of the Board, whose 17 members are drawn from the senior ranks of academic staff in each campus, from research units and from the postgraduate students across the university.

The specific statutory powers of the Board, most of which are delegated by Senate, include responsibility for academic policy (but not for advising Council on the provision of facilities to implement that policy, which responsibility is assigned to the Board by *Ordinance 29* where such policy relates to higher degrees and advanced diplomas), for the direction and regulation of the teaching, instruction and examinations pertinent to graduate studies, for the award of graduate degrees, diplomas and certificates other than Honorary Degrees, for the making of regulations related to programmes of study and examinations, admissions to, continuance in and graduation from such programmes, for the monitoring and control of quality in those academic units engaged in the delivery of graduate programmes and research and, as noted previously, for library services.

In addition, the Board is accorded powers delegated by the University and Campus Councils regarding the promotion and provision of research and the management of research scholarships and awards.

The Task Force received a written analysis from the Dean of the Graduate School (one of the Co-Chairs of the Board) on the provisions of *Statute 30* and the efforts that had been made to carry these out. It also had the opportunity to review the booklet produced by the School for Graduate Studies and Research, entitled “Unlocking Caribbean Potential”, which outlined the mission and vision of the School and highlighted its successes and challenges. In addition, the Task Force received written submissions and oral comments from the Pro Vice-Chancellor in charge of Research, from the postgraduate students and other key past and present University personnel, as well as from persons outside the university.

The picture emerging from those varied sources was a mixed one. There had clearly been some important gains in the areas of graduate studies and research: the School had developed Vision and Mission Statements to guide its work; the numbers of graduate students had increased; existing Centres and Institutes dedicated to research had been strengthened through amalgamation and new ones had been established; new graduate programmes had been introduced that responded to perceived needs in the public and private sectors; inter-disciplinary approaches had been encouraged; valuable linkages had been forged with other higher education institutions in the region and abroad; useful partnerships with public and private sector agencies had been established; valuable research in important areas had been undertaken.

Despite these laudable successes, however, from the comments received there still was a perception that more emphasis on and investment in these areas were needed to further strengthen the level of scholarship underpinning the university’s own programmes and operations, to enhance its standing in the international arena, and to ensure its effective contribution to the development of the countries of the region. Some respondents suggested that, within the University itself, the School was not very visible, that the area of graduate studies and research generally was viewed as an enclave unto itself, with little real connection to the Faculties, and that policy decisions were not widely known.

Some specific difficulties that had been encountered by the School and the Board were identified. Among them were the following: the composition of the Board as outlined in the *Statute* did not specify who was to chair the Board, though the original intention was that the Dean of the School would carry out that function. The current arrangement of having two Pro Vice-Chancellors (PVCs) - one for Graduate Studies and the other for Research co-chair the Board appeared to result in overlap and duplication of responsibilities. The situation of having separate PVCs for Graduate Studies and Research had resulted apparently from specific circumstances existing when the new structure was first introduced. The Task Force was informed that this arrangement was intended to be temporary. The composition of the Board did not include specific representation of Deans, and this appeared to create some difficulty in the formulation and implementation of policies that required Faculty input and support. The Board’s authority to insist upon compliance with policy directions was not clearly stipulated in the *Statute*.

In addition, where the School enrolled students of its own, issues as to how tuition income should be distributed among various entities created tensions and had an impact upon the self-sustaining efforts of the School. Indeed, the general question of how activities of the School and the Board should be funded needed to be clearly addressed: there seemed to be the intent that these should be self-sustaining.

It is incontrovertible that effective postgraduate programmes and high quality research on the part of students and academic staff are more crucial than ever to the university and its contributing countries in the current environment of increasing competition in higher education and in face of the challenges of globalisation. There would seem to be a continuing need, therefore, for a strong focal point for these activities in order to ensure their prominence in the overall operation of the institution.

It appeared that the School was modelled on a graduate institution that served predominantly or exclusively post-graduate education, employed dedicated staff and had its dedicated source of funding. Given this model, it was not surprising to hear of the tension that existed between the School and the departments which were in some measure divorced from one of their basic functions of carrying out and supervising research.

The Task Force was convinced that research students were an integral and necessary part of the university departments and institutes as currently constituted. The appropriate locus and focus for research was in the departments and institutes, which did not negate the critical need for a body to coordinate the university's thrusts in this area and oversee the observance of the regulation as regards all graduate programmes. The concept of the School having dedicated students and possibly staff was not currently viable.

The Task Force recommends that:

- The functions for the Board remain as set out in *Statute 30*
- The Graduate School be disestablished and the relevant *Statute* and *Ordinances* be changed to effect this. The functions assigned to the Board under *Statute 30* may be discharged in the absence of a School.
- The modified *Statute* should include the designation of a Chair of the Board to be a Pro Vice-Chancellor selected by the Vice-Chancellor subject to *Statute 5.5(a)*
- Deans be represented on the Board.
- The Office of the School should become the Office of the Board for Graduate Studies and Research and function in relation to the Board in a manner similar to that exercised by OBUS in relation to BUS
- The Office seek collaboration with the Faculties to address the needs for student-centeredness at the post-graduate level and to stimulate multi-centered research
- The design and delivery of the programmes should be the responsibility of the Faculties and other teaching and research units
- The Office retains responsibility for policy regulation and approval, monitoring and examination of courses and programmes

4.3.3 Board for Non-Campus Countries and Distance Education: Relationships with the NCCs

The 1994 Commission's Report noted that the 1984 restructuring of the University (especially the financial arrangements) had strengthened the national focus of the campus countries and had tended to marginalise the University's work in and services to the so-called "non-campus countries" and to threaten the regional nature of the institution. It recommended that the University should give its work in the NCCs a priority equal the work on its three Campuses; a policy statement should clarify the status of NCC students; the University Centres should be fully integrated with local tertiary colleges, which should undertake as much teaching as feasible, up to baccalaureate degree level and academic staff participation in outreach work within the NCCs should be regarded as integral to their responsibilities and evaluation processes.

Further, the evolution of distance education initiatives and the stated intention for the University to develop into a dual-mode institution were seen as holding significant promise for increasing student numbers in both non-campus and campus countries. In addition, the emergence of a variety of tertiary level institutions throughout the contributing countries required policies and mechanisms to manage the University's relationships with them. These varied responsibilities had to that point been discharged by several separate agencies within the University whose roles and relationships to one another were not necessarily clearly coordinated. The Governance Commission therefore saw the need for a Board that would draw together those disparate elements and manage in a coherent way the relationships with and programmes in the non-campus countries and in Centres outside of the main Campuses in the Campus countries.

Statute 29 formally establishes the BNCCs&DE whose powers are, first, "***to promote, develop and administer the work of the university in the non-Campus Countries,***" and, additionally, to have "***direct responsibility for the effective delivery of programmes to such countries.***" The Board is also to set policies for, coordinate and monitor the work of the School of Continuing Studies (SCS). By delegation from Senate, the Board also is assigned powers to exercise general responsibility for library services and to "promote, develop and administer ...distance education, continuing studies, external and extension work in the contributing countries."

The 18 members of the Board represent the wide range of interests to be served by the Board: a chair of PVC status, the Vice-Chancellor or nominee; government representatives from the NCCs; representatives of the tertiary institutions; senior university academics; the head of the SCS; Resident Tutors from the NCCs; and (by authority of *Ordinance 47*) the heads of the TLIU and the UWIDEC.

The Chair of the Board provided the Task Force with detailed written and oral analyses of the structure, functions, successes and challenges of the Board and of the critical issues that needed to be addressed for the future. The Task Force also considered comments and proposals advanced in written and oral submissions from its own members and from individuals within and outside of the university, including university representatives from the NCCs.

Several measures had been developed over the years to accommodate the legitimate demands of the NCCs for some equivalence of treatment. There is representation on all the major university bodies. University Centres had been established in all the countries. A significant initiative had been the modification of the funding formula to provide a discount to the NCC students to reflect the location advantages campus countries derived from the presence of a campus.

There was considerable agreement emerging from these varied sources that the Board had made laudable, wide-ranging efforts since its inception to enhance UWI's relations with those countries without a campus and to fulfill the several aspects of its statutory mandate. Notable successes had been achieved: enrolment in distance education courses had increased substantially (mainly, however, in Centres in the campus countries); numerous articulation agreements had been concluded with TLIs and a number of franchise arrangements had been effected; through the SCS, a series of Country Conferences had been held to provide a forum for the presentation of research on issues of importance to individual territories; the TLIU had fostered a variety of professional development opportunities for staff members of TLIs; a recent proposal, jointly developed with BUS, addressed the feasibility of the university's recognising selected TLIs as Colleges of the UWI; distance education facilities had been upgraded in a number of countries and some improvements had been made to University Centres. The efforts of the Board had, moreover, generally raised the visibility of the NCCs in the university.

Despite these many commendable efforts however, the Task Force is persuaded that many of the concerns articulated in the 1994 Report still persist. The university's work in the NCCs is still considered by some members of the university as peripheral to the mainstream of the institution's work. Difficulties of communication and timeliness of responses to Resident Tutors and students in the NCCs remain a problem and a sense of isolation continues to be experienced. The status of students in Centres outside of the main campuses would benefit from greater clarification. The SCS was not viewed as an integral part of the UWI by some members of the university. Further, in face of the many challenges emerging in the rapidly changing social and educational environment of the region, the Board and its current mandate are not considered sufficient to address the university's relationships with all its constituencies. Such relationships are of signal importance for the university's continuing status as a regional university.

The term "Non-Campus Countries" has been viewed more and more widely as pejorative, and there is a growing recognition that an indispensable element in the preservation and strengthening of the UWI's regional nature is the development of a campus, not necessarily in a traditional sense, within each country or territory served. Meanwhile, University Centres across the Caribbean have been constrained in their curriculum delivery by the lack of classroom space; dependence on campus based faculties for the resources to deliver programs using distance learning; limited staffing, given expanded registration and student management functions related to the implementation of distance programs; continuing inefficiencies in the administrative linkages between students in the NCCs with the campuses and faculties in which they are

registered; and a weak financial base for the support of University Centre-based initiatives

The many dramatic changes that have occurred in the modes of delivery of educational services, largely as a result of potential of the Internet in this connection, are noted by a number of respondents as having profound implications for the definition of outreach and 'distance' education, and for the organisation and activities of the units specifically charged with managing those aspects of the university's work on behalf of the Board and, indeed, for the approaches adopted by the academic units at large.

In this context, reference was made to the Caribbean Knowledge and Learning Network (CKLN) which was launched on July 4, 2004, following endorsement of the CKLN by CARICOM Heads of Government on March 26, 2004. The total estimated cost is US\$25.6 million, and potential funding sources include the Organisation of American States (OAS), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), European Union (EU) and the Institute for Connectivity in the Americas. A related contract for institutional strengthening was awarded by the OAS through ACTI on March 1, 2005. The goal is to use information and communications technology to strengthen regional tertiary institutions, foster specialisation and knowledge sharing; ensure the convergence of fragmented regional and international initiatives to maximise results in the area of tertiary and distance education; and provide a gateway to knowledge resources available elsewhere. It is projected that an IT Centre of Excellence will be located on the Campus of an existing tertiary education institution, with the objective of building a broad base of highly trained IT professionals in the Caribbean, in partnership with private sector IT companies. The CKLN is expected to enhance infrastructure and bandwidth capacity at all 27 UWIDEC Learning Centres, but funding limitations suggest that this Network may have a role in amplifying the capacities of UWIDEC only in the medium-term.

What is abundantly clear at this juncture is that change in the structure and functions of the current Board is required to reflect a more fundamental reconceptualisation of the university's role in the countries and communities outside of the main campuses. Any reconceptualisation and restructuring should be based upon the principles of campus development in each country or territory; the elaboration of a flexible set of relationships between the UWI and regional TLIs, ranging from franchising, staff development, and articulation to partnership and possible merger, together with strategically managed relationships between the UWI and selected extra-regional universities active in the region; an effective system of distributed or blended education throughout the region, making full use of the emerging potentials of the CKLN;

The Task Force is persuaded that there may be two fundamental issues which are being conflated in consideration of the UWI activities in the NCCs. The issue of distance education is critical but not exclusively related to the NCC students. There are and will be many students within and outside of the NCCs who will benefit from distance education

or the more appropriate approach of blended learning. A separate issue is the legitimate desire of the NCCs to have a stronger university presence in these countries that satisfies more fully the needs of their students. These needs include those related to instruction as well as the various administrative arrangements.

The Task Force was informed of the Vice-Chancellor's decision to hold a series of country consultations in the NCCs to establish the optimal input the University should make into tertiary education in those countries. The results of those consultations may cause modification of any recommendations made now.

Several recommendations for immediate adjustments to the existing arrangement are necessary. First, there appears to be consensus that the name of the Board should be changed. The term "*non-campus*" has over time acquired a somewhat pejorative connotation that implies secondary status. It is proposed that an acceptable name be given to the Board to reflect the scope of responsibilities given to it, as in the case of the other two Boards.

The Task Force recommends that:

- There should be a campus presence established in each of the 15 countries
- The term "*non-campus countries*" be abolished
- **The term "New Campus Countries" be used to distinguish these 12 countries from the 3 "Old Campus Countries" of Jamaica, Trinidad & Tobago, and Barbados**
- The University presence in the New Campus Countries (NCCs) be simply designated "the University of the West Indies in **CountryX**"
- The Board be retained, but the name changed to reflect the use of the term New Campus Countries and should not include Distance Education
- The composition of the Board as outlined in *Statute 29* is appropriate for the functions as set out above
- *Ordinance 47* should be modified to reflect the inclusion of two (2) students nominated by the Presidents of the Guild of Students, at least one of whom must be pursuing a programme in an NCC
- The Office of the Board be restructured with units that reflect the major areas of work - SCS, institutional relations and e-learning.
- An Academic Programme Committee be established to oversee the academic offerings made to the NCCs
- The University should establish bursarial and registrarial services specifically for the NCCs
- The Office of the Board and the administrative offices as well as the Pro Vice-Chancellor as its Chair should be physically located in one of the NCCs
- The University should restructure its programme of distance education or blended learning to accommodate all of the university as well as reaching extra-regionally. The base for this programme would be from the presently constituted curriculum development and technical services - (UWIDEC). The responsibility for this programme would continue to reside in the Board.

- The University must decide whether the responsibility for providing content to this programme should rest with current Faculty in the relevant departments, institutes or centres when it must be made a part of the contractual arrangements and appropriately compensated or whether there should be staff dedicated to this function

SECTION 5: THE POWERS OF SENATE

Under the *Charter* of the University, the third ranked body is the Senate. Although it ranks after the Council and the Campus Councils, its meetings have not been regularly scheduled since the 1996 restructuring. This reflects the most recent stage in a long history of decline in the part played by the Senate in the University's affairs.

Until 1973, the Senate regularly undertook the supervisory role of the University in academic matters. The Academic Boards were already in existence with varying levels of delegated authority: each Campus had its own separate Academic Board Regulations.

The most important campus-level function shared by all campuses was probably the advisory function in relation to budgeting and estimates for the academic programme in particular. This in practice was exercised by a committee at the Campus reporting to a committee of Senate. The significant power of student admission was delegated to Academic Board by regulations, but was and still is exercised by the Faculties.

But even the delegation to Academic Boards did not prevent the Senate actively exercising its ultimate authority, and dealing with all significant matters of academic policy. So since the membership of Senate included all Professors and all Heads of Departments *ex officio*, with the compounded problems of the cost of travel thus added to the basic difficulty of organising a committee of that size, the anxiety for reform was understandable.

The first reform was the creation of University Academic Committee (UAC), a smaller body comprising the Vice-Chancellor, Pro Vice-Chancellors, Deans and Academic Board representatives, with a majority of non-official members. That body was given all the functions of Senate which could be delegated under the *Statutes* and which were not delegated elsewhere: the only significant exception to the delegation was therefore the power to participate in the amendment of *Statutes*. Senate continued nevertheless to meet annually before 1984 and triennially thereafter to receive reports of the bodies exercising Senate's delegated authority, quite apart from occasional meetings to deal with proposed *Statute* amendments.

UAC survived the restructuring of 1984, with the creation of the Campus Councils and the devolution of much of the Council's financial authority to the campuses. The devolution to Academic Boards did not, however, match the devolution of financial authority. But Academic Boards were permitted to approve syllabuses: technically a revocable delegation, and subject to an understanding that Academic Board would not exercise this power except after receiving confirmation of prior cross-campus consultation.

There was, however, a significant weakening of the power of the Senate in relation to financial matters, in that the academic input into the budgeting process for the campus budgets, where most of the money is spent, was devolved by Statute to Academic Boards (which in practice acted through their Planning and Estimates Committees).

The position of the Senate under the *Charter* obviously reflects the tradition of academic government of Universities which was current in Britain at the time the University College of the West Indies was created as a satellite of London University. In practice, all Senate's *Charter* powers were real, even when delegated to UAC. The powers were constrained in practice, however, by the fact that the University was still predominantly financed by the governments of the contributing countries who formed the majority on Council and this therefore tended to enhance the power of Council.

The 1996 restructuring based on the Governance Report, however, represented a policy decision which tended to go against the tradition of academic self-government. It was recognised that the *Charter* stood in the way of the full implementation of this new policy because of its entrenchment of the Senate. The difficulty of amending the *Charter*, however, was a practical barrier to the full implementation of the policy, and the decision was therefore taken to limit restructuring to what could be done without amending the present *Charter*.

The powers of amending the *Statutes* were accordingly used in the Governance Report to delegate Senate's powers principally to the three new Boards - BUS, BGSR and BNCCs&DE. Senate's authority in matters relating to undergraduate studies was delegated to BUS, in relation to graduate studies to BGSR, and in relation to non-campus countries and the organisation of the logistics of distance education, to BNCCs&DE. The extensive delegations to the Academic Boards largely remained in place. Senate's authority over the preparation of estimates was delegated to the University Strategy Committee. Since 1996, Senate has been convened only for the amendment of the *Statutes* and for deciding questions of academic dress.

A theoretical difficulty with the current situation is that there remain substantial powers of Senate in relation to which there is no obvious delegation. The authority to make disciplinary regulations for students is perhaps the most striking example. But the number of references to Senate authority in the *Statutes* left other miscellaneous instances not explicitly provided for. And there was no provision for delegation of Senate's general residual right to consultation in relation to any matters with academic implications, an important power whose limits would defy listing.

One approach to the theoretical problem, if a general system of reliable legal authority for the full range of University decisions is considered desirable, is to seek to itemise the powers not delegated and to delegate them to bodies already in existence. The principal difficulty here is the unlikelihood of being able to predict all the possible issues with academic implications which engage the residuary *Charter* authority of the Senate. The Council's authority has, of course, exactly the same difficulty of itemisation, but

since there is no policy inhibition against convening Council, the lack of specification causes no inconvenience.

Even where the powers which need delegation are listed, there is an obvious problem in identifying suitable delegates for some of the powers. Student discipline, in particular, is not markedly different in its incidence as between graduate and undergraduate students, but there is no committee other than Senate with academic jurisdiction over both. But with the identifiable issues, a possible solution could be to create Joint Committees of the existing Boards to deal with such matters.

Another approach might be to reverse the policy of attempting to do without the Senate in relation to what remains undelegated, and to resume holding meetings of the Senate. This could have practical advantages, particularly since it seems a convenient method of heading off any possible number of legal challenges. The Senate is now a far smaller body than before, and electronic meeting is now expressly permitted, so its meetings do not have significant cost implications.

The Task Force recommends that:

- Meetings of Senate should be held as required to deal with those aspects of Senate powers which are not currently delegated.

SECTION 6: "A RELEVANT AND RESPECTED REGIONAL INSTITUTION ESSENTIAL TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CARIBBEAN"

In almost all the written and oral submissions, the Task Force heard of the need to retain the University of the West Indies as a regional institution. Some of the submissions were based on the fact that the Grand Anse Declaration was still relevant, some were based on positive recollections of personal history and some on the conviction that at a time when there was a new thrust for Caribbean integration there was even greater need for the University to continue to be regional in theory and practice.

Because the notion and concept of what represents the essence of the regional nature of the University have been evoked so often, the Task Force thought it appropriate to set out briefly those characteristics that, taken together, made it uniquely regional, rather than a national university simply situated within the region.

- a) ***Geographical location.*** The University is regional by virtue of its presence in 15 of the Caribbean countries. It is not only an institution in the region as is the case for many other tertiary institutions, but because of its geographic reach it can be said to claim the exclusivity of regionalism. Geographical location in one of the countries of the region is not enough to merit the designation of being a regional institution.
- b) ***History.*** The University, since inception in 1948, has continuously contributed to the development of a Caribbean identity, Caribbean civilisation, and regional integration. It has produced generations of Caribbean leaders, entrepreneurs, artists, writers, and public officials; a record that contributed to the recognition accorded to it by the Grand Anse Declaration of 1989, and the evolution of its institutional brand.
- c) ***Financial support.*** The UWI is supported by the vast majority of the Anglophone Caribbean governments.
- d) ***Mode of governance.*** The participation of the member countries and a wide range of Caribbean nationals in its Councils ensure that its focus is on both national as well as regional issues.
- e) ***Provision of regional public goods.*** The UWI is the only university that has the remit of the governments of the regions for the provision of regional public goods. This encompasses the research and production of data and information about regional problems as well as the provision of the environment in which Caribbean

youths engage with one another and develop the notion of a “Caribbean identity” that is essential for the progress of Caribbean integration.

- f) **Structural economies of scope and scale.** Within the context of the Caribbean Single Market, the UWI offers unique opportunities for regional countries to secure structural economies of scope and scale, by the creation of enriched curricular and co-curricular experiences for their students. These experiences provide significant and sustained value-added, by systematically incorporating a regional element into their education, using both distance and classroom techniques, with the over-arching goal of increasing the capacity of graduates to contribute to development and economic growth, at both national and regional levels.

It is clear that the university offers its products - educational services, research and outreach - through its decentralised units in the campuses and the NCCs. The Vice-Chancellor in his submission made the relevant point. He wrote:

“..Leaders and constituents at the campus level should be required to demonstrate that in addition to their campuses, they are contributing meaningfully to the regional enterprise. With respect to governance too, campus based governing bodies should be constituted and run so that the degree to which that contributes to the regional university is always tested and assessed.”

The Vice-Chancellor went on to point out that the university was not getting its story out and many of the activities that were genuinely regional were not being recognised or advertised. But his view was that in the final analysis...

“Until all members of our community believe that there is value to being a regional entity, and that their role is to enhance the whole as opposed to their local campuses alone, the meaningful existence of a regional university will remain elusive.”

The university can learn from the experience of the only other genuinely regional institution of this kind - the University of the South Pacific (USP). If the governance structure of the UWI is compared with that of the USP, several similarities and dissimilarities emerge. Both have three main campuses and institutional representation in each of the remaining member countries. Both seek to develop regional tertiary education systems, in collaboration with local tertiary learning institutions. Both are exploiting the potentials of e-learning and telecommunications, as well as video communications, in order to expand the scope of curricular offerings, conferences, workshops and seminars across their systems, and to enable cross-campus administrative meetings. Both emphasise to stakeholders that national strategies need to be complemented by regional strategies, to optimise the use of scarce resources, and for member states to relate most effectively to the international system.

However, USP has also sought with demonstrable success to ensure that its 12-member countries maintain the regional integrity of the University, by explicitly encouraging their sense of collective ownership, while distributing benefits generated

through services provided and expenditures made equitably across member countries. The USP is committed to academic staff, if not necessarily student mobility, across its service region, and intends to develop all of its regional or 'continuing education' centres into campuses, working closely with each host government, while relocating (and amalgamating, as necessary) Institutes and Centres broadly across all of its member countries.

The view has been expressed that the maintenance of the desired regionality has in the past decade depended to a large extent on the personal characteristics of successive Chancellors and Vice-Chancellors, but the Task Force is convinced that if regionality is indeed to be maintained, this is not adequate and there have to be some accepted structures and processes to support such a focus.

An institution that is relevant should have within its structures an entity that brings coherence to its interface with the external environment. Such an entity might be given the mission of linking the UWI to the development of the Caribbean community with a sense of research and teaching in the Caribbean and overseas.

The Task Force recommends that:

- A university international centre be established to drive the process of coherence in the interface and to coordinate the efforts of relevant campus offices.

6.1 Strengthening Regionality

This section outlines the possible structures and processes for sustaining and preserving regionality.

6.1.1 Mobility of Staff and Students

Staff. There is general agreement that inter-country movement of staff and academic interaction are desirable and formal provision should be made for them. The nature of the attachments and the form and duration are issues to be developed and budgeted within a University-wide plan and as a part of each Faculty's commitment to the regional objective.

Students. One of the unique values of UWI in its early years was that it brought together students from all over the English-speaking Caribbean to study and interact together at a campus. This is no longer so as Mona attracts only 7%, St. Augustine 10% and Cave Hill 16% of students from outside the host country. The following proposals are put forward as small, sustainable measures towards addressing the issue:

- *Undergraduate Scholarships for Study at the Three Old Campuses.* This would be targeted specifically at students from the NCCs. The university is already offering scholarships to NCC students through its campus in Barbados. This should be addressed as a university-wide effort.

- ***Study at another Campus (Millennium Fund).*** The University had established a fund to support students studying for a semester or for a year at another campus. Regrettably, this has not been tapped to the desired extent and the available sum has not been utilized in full. The university now needs to embark on an even more energetic marketing of this option, collaborating with the Guild of Students in promoting the opportunity.
- ***Summer Educational Tours.*** During the period of the Federal boats (Palm and Maple) in the 1960s, many students were able to tour the Eastern Caribbean and gain first-hand knowledge and experience of those islands. In recent times, students look forward to selection for Inter-Campus Games and similar competitions to get a glimpse of another campus country. The university already supports educational visits to Martinique/ (French) and Guyana/Suriname (Linguistics) through its campus in Jamaica. The university and the Centre should develop programmes to encourage educational visits to and co-curricular interchange among the Caribbean countries.
- ***Single Campus Offerings.*** These programmes which require student travel to a campus in order to pursue a particular programme of study have been effective in ensuring student mobility across campuses. The university has single faculties exclusive to its campuses in Barbados and Trinidad & Tobago, but none exists in Jamaica. Currently, the programme areas at Mona which have remained exclusive to that campus, Geography and Media and Communications, are gradually being duplicated on other campuses. It may be that some programmes need to be retained exclusively by one campus or to be designed in such a way that students would pursue and complete their degrees by studying on two campuses as is the case with students in Jamaica and Trinidad & Tobago who study Law.

The Task Force recommends that:

- It should be the policy of the university to retain geographical exclusivity of some programmes in order to enhance the educational experience of the students.

6.1.2 Academic Oversight

With the disappearance of the University Dean, there was no longer a locus for coordinating cross-campus academic offerings. The appointment of University Subject Leaders with the responsibilities outlined by the 1994 Implementation Committee was rejected by the university community when it was proposed. Yet, cross- and inter-campus discussion on matters relating to teaching, examination and research are important aspects of the maintenance of university quality as well as regionality. The Deans recognise this and formed themselves into an informal Committee of Deans which has become a significant forum for cross-campus exchange of academic and administrative matters and elaboration of common approaches.

The Task Force is persuaded of the value of formalising the Committee of Deans within the University structure and creating the appropriate *Ordinance* to do so. This Committee can provide the forum for discussion of academic imperatives and

intercampus collaboration within and across Faculties, and so has the potential to expand and deepen faculty cooperation and also stimulate and enhance the interdisciplinary thrust which is increasingly important.

The Task Force recommends that:

- The Committee of Deans be established as a Standing Committee of Senate.

SECTION 7: MANAGERIAL ISSUES

It is not within the remit of the Task Force to address the managerial practices within the university, but several of these were raised in the course of our interviews and from many of the submissions. Some have been mentioned so often and with such emphasis that we feel it is worthwhile to bring them to the attention of the Vice-Chancellor, who is ultimately responsible for the management of the institution.

Coordination at the senior management level. The Task Force heard of the regular meetings of senior management, but it is convinced that there is considerable merit in institutionalising regular, calendarised meetings of the Vice-Chancellor and the Principals plus the Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for the NCCs. The preservation of the regional focus of the institution and the coordination of the outward thrust of the University cannot be left to non-programmed meetings of the principal actors.

Registrarial functions. The University Registrar is the head of the institution's administration and this office plus those at Campus level play a critical role in ensuring its operational efficiency. It is critical that these offices have the capacity and authority to exercise this role and be seen and acknowledged to have such, if there is to be efficient administration of the regional institution. These offices were established and organised at a time when the university was much less complex, so there should now be a careful examination of the roles and structures that should be performed by this office and its Campus homologs.

Communications. The university needs to strengthen both its internal and external communications. There was frequent mention made of failures of communication with the NCCs in a wide range of areas, including reporting of examination results. It is also critical that there be frequent and effective communication to the various publics served by the University through the various media, including the internet. This is tied to the need for much more effective internal and external marketing of the institution and what it does. Some of these issues were addressed in the section setting out the weaknesses observed and are repeated here for emphasis

Management competencies. It was noted that many academics who assume managerial responsibility, including being principal budget holders, have had no exposure to management and would benefit from some formal instruction. The university should develop training opportunities to improve the preparedness of the academic managers.

University meetings. The university does much of its formal business through meetings and several negative comments on the effectiveness and efficiency of meetings as well as lack of participation were related to the manner in which the Agendas were

constructed and the items presented. Efficient conduct of meetings is clearly facilitated by the timely circulation of documents.

Documentation. The university must appreciate that the Minutes of its meetings are documents of record. On too many occasions the Task force found it very difficult to appreciate what had transpired from the formal documentation. Verbatim notes are not necessary, but it is important that there be an adequate record and clarity of follow-up responsibility. The accuracy of major policy decisions of the institution and the rationale for taking them should not be left to individual memory.

Evaluation. The Task Force is pleased to note the Vice-Chancellor's initiative to establish a system of monitoring and evaluation of senior officers. We understand that such systems already exist at the other levels of the institution.

SECTION 8: INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

The review process undertaken by the UWI Governance Task Force 2004 has been a valuable assessment of the effectiveness of the governance of the UWI and the functioning of its major committees.

The Task Force recommends that:

- A similar review process, broader in scope to address the performance of the institution as a whole, be undertaken at 5 to 7-year intervals, to examine the performance of the UWI in relation to its strategic objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE

Sub-section 4.1 The University Council

1. There be no changes to the powers of Council as set out in *Statute 20*
2. The representation of the contributing countries should be maintained, but there should be reductions of the nominees in most of the other categories while still retaining adequate representation of the key stakeholders
3. The Agendas of its meetings should be structured and documentation presented in a timely manner to ensure that it fulfilled its role as the major policy body of the institution
4. Council should elaborate and promulgate a Statement of its Primary Responsibilities
5. The post of Treasurer should be formally abolished. It was never established
6. The post of Pro-Chancellor should be formally abolished
7. The size of the Council should be reduced and the composition should be as follows:
 - Chancellor - **Chair**
 - Vice-Chancellor (1)
 - Campus Principals (3)
 - Chairs of the Campus Councils (3)
 - University Registrar (1)
 - University Bursar (1)
 - Chairs of the Boards (3)
 - Representatives of governments of contributing countries (15)
 - Chancellor's nominees (5) **N.B: to be rotated on a 3-yearly basis**
 - Representatives of Academic Boards (4)
 - Chair of Committee of Deans (1)
 - Representative of the Assoc. of Caribbean Tertiary Institutions (ACTI) (1)
 - Alumni representatives (2)
 - Guild of Students (3)
 - Representative of Senior Administrative & Professional Staff (1)
 - Representative of the Administrative, Technical & Service Staff (1)

8. The Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor would invite members of staff to serve in advisory capacity.

Sub-section 4.1.1 University Finance & General Purposes Committee

9. The category in *Clause 5(g) of Ordinance 9* should be eliminated and replaced by the following:
 - a) Three (3) persons from the general public with expertise in financial matters to be nominated by the Chancellor
10. The Agendas must be constructed to allow the Committee to perform its statutory functions
11. The Minutes should be summarised for presentation at Campus F&GPC so that matters arising from these minutes can be considered

Sub-section 4.1.2 University Strategy Committee

12. The Strategy Committee should be renamed the “Strategy and Planning Committee”
13. The functions of the Committee should be clearly defined to include those set out in *Ordinance 10, Clause 5*; advising on the university’s planning operations and functions; evaluating the university’s Strategic Plan for presentation to Council; evaluating the budgetary implications and monitoring the Plan against its Key Performance Indicators
14. The strategic planning function in the Office of the Vice-Chancellor should be strengthened considerably to allow for enhanced input into and rationalisation of the plans being made at various places in the university and rationalisation of the use of the institution’s resources and exploitation of synergies as they occur
15. *Ordinance 10, Clause 2* should be modified given that University Council is to be the major forum for making university policy
16. The Committee should meet with sufficient frequency to discharge its functions and in advance of the Annual Business Meeting of Council to allow for adequate input into the discussions at University Council.
17. The composition of the Committee should be as follows:
 - Vice-Chancellor (1)
 - Chairs of the Boards (3)
 - Campus Principals (3)
 - University Registrar (1)

- University Bursar (1)
- Representatives of Academic Board (4)
- Chair of the Committee of Deans (1)
- Alumnus representative (1)
- Student representative (1)
- Chancellor's nominees (3) **N.B: to be persons with relevant expertise**
- Head of University Strategic Planning Unit (1)

Sub-section 4.2.1 Campus Councils

18. The functions should remain as outlined in *Statute 21*, but the Task Force has taken note of Campus Council's decision with respect to *Clause 1(k)*
19. The membership of the Campus Councils should remain as currently established, but every deliberate effort must be made to include representation from the NCCs under *Clauses 1(h)* of *Statute 19*
20. *Statute 21*, relating to the Powers of Campus Council be amended such that:
 - a) the campus estimates should be generated by the Campus F&GPC to be presented to the University Council; and
 - b) the financial matters pertaining to Fellowships, etc. that are campus specific be delegated fully to the Campus Council

Sub-section 4.2.2 Campus Finance & General Purposes Committees

21. The functions should remain as set out in the *Ordinance*
22. The Campus F&GPCs remain as bodies which relate to the Campus Councils in the same manner as the University F&GPC relates to the University Council
23. The meetings of the Campus F&GPC must be formalised and calendarised
24. The membership of the Committee should be as set out in *Ordinance 25*
25. A representative of the Office of Student Services should be in attendance at meetings.

Sub-section 4.3.1 Board for Undergraduate Studies

26. The functions of the Board remain the same as in *Statute 28*, but notes that *Clause 3* be amended to reflect the Board's responsibility for assessing the process

27. The membership of the Board at *Statute 28, Clause 1(c)* should include the Deputy Principal of each campus, two (2) representatives of each Academic Board one of whom must be a Dean and the Chair of the Committee of Deans
28. The Board recommend to Campus F&GPCs the resources needed to implement recommended policy or quality assurance initiatives
29. Formal budgetary provision should be made for those mechanisms (such as staff mobility across campuses) deemed necessary to preserve the regional character of the university's work.
30. The responsibility for library services which has been delegated to three Boards be fixed in the Board for Undergraduate Studies in the exercise of which there will be appropriate consultation.

Sub-section 4.3.2 Board for Graduate Studies and Research (The Graduate School)

31. The functions for the Board remain as set out in *Statute 30*
32. The Graduate School be disestablished and the relevant *Statute* and *Ordinances* be changed to effect this. The functions assigned to the Board under *Statute 30* may be discharged in the absence of a School
33. The modified *Statute* should include the designation of a Chair of the Board to be a Pro Vice-Chancellor selected by the Vice-Chancellor subject to *Statute 5.5(a)*
34. Deans be represented on the Board
35. The Office of the School should become the Office of the Board for Graduate Studies and Research and function in relation to the Board in a manner similar to that exercised by OBUS in relation to BUS
36. The Office seek collaboration with the Faculties to address the needs for student-centeredness at the post-graduate level and to stimulate multi-centered research
37. The design and delivery of the programmes should be the responsibility of the Faculties and other teaching and research units
38. The Office retains responsibility for policy regulation and approval, monitoring and examination of courses and programmes

Sub-section 4.3.3 Board for Non-Campus Countries & Distance Education: Relations with the NCCs

39. There should be a campus presence established in each of the 15 countries
40. The term “*non-campus countries*” be abolished
41. **The term “New Campus Countries” be used to distinguish these 12 countries from the 3 “Old Campus Countries” of Jamaica, Trinidad & Tobago, and Barbados**
42. The University presence in the New Campus Countries (NCCs) be simply designated “the University of the West Indies in **CountryX**”
43. The Board be retained, but the name changed to reflect the use of the term New Campus Countries and should not include Distance Education
44. The composition of the Board as outlined in *Statute 29* is appropriate for the functions as set out above
45. *Ordinance 47* should be modified to reflect the inclusion of two (2) students nominated by the Presidents of the Guild of Students, at least one of whom must be pursuing a programme in an NCC
46. The Office of the Board be restructured with units that reflect the major areas of work - SCS, institutional relations and e-learning
47. An Academic Programme Committee be established to oversee the academic offerings made to the NCCs
48. The University should establish bursarial and registrarial services specifically for the NCCs
49. The Office of the Board and the administrative offices as well as the Pro Vice-Chancellor as its Chair should be physically located in one of the NCCs
50. The University should restructure its programme of distance education or blended learning to accommodate all of the university as well as reaching extra-regionally. The base for this programme would be from the presently constituted curriculum development and technical services - (UWIDEC). The responsibility for this programme would continue to reside in the Board

51. The University must decide whether the responsibility for providing content to this programme should rest with current Faculty in the relevant departments, institutes or centres when it must be made a part of the contractual arrangements and appropriately compensated or whether there should be staff dedicated to this function

Section 5 The Powers of Senate

52. Meetings of Senate should be held as required to deal with those aspects of Senate powers which are not currently delegated

Section 6 "A Relevant and Respected Regional Institution Essential to the Development of the Caribbean"

53. A university international centre be established to drive the process of coherence in the interface and to coordinate the efforts of relevant campus offices

Sub-section 6.1 Strengthening Regionality

54. It should be the policy of the university to retain geographical exclusivity of some programmes in order to enhance the educational experience of the students

Sub-section 6.1.2 Academic Oversight

55. The Committee of Deans be established as a Standing Committee of Senate

Section 8 Institutional Assessment

56. A similar review process, broader in scope to address the performance of the institution as a whole, be undertaken at 5 to 7-year intervals, to examine the performance of the UWI in relation to its strategic objectives

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE WITH ACCOMPANYING RELEVANT STATUTES and ORDINANCES

In order to facilitate understanding of those recommendations of the Task Force which involve change in the existing *Statutes and Ordinances*, the present document sets out the relevant Recommendations accompanied by the relevant *Statute* and *Ordinance*.

Recommendation 2

The representation of the contributing countries should be maintained, but there should be reductions of the nominees in most of the other categories while still retaining adequate representation of the key stakeholders

See *Statute 18, clause 1(a) to (j)*:

- 1 *The Council shall consist of the following persons:-*
 - (a) *The Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Chancellor, the Chairs of the Campus Councils, the Treasurer, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors, the Campus Principals, and the University Registrar, who shall be members of the Council by virtue of their respective offices*
 - (b) *Four members elected by each of the Academic Boards, three of whom must be a dean, a Head of Department and a non-professorial member of staff;*
 - (c) *Four graduates elected by the Guild of Graduates from among their number;*
 - (d) *One member appointed by the Government of each of the Contributing Countries;*
 - (e) *Not more than ten persons appointed by the Chancellor, regard being had to the desirability of including in the membership of the Council persons of high international, regional or national standing from the professions, commerce, industry, the public service, the labour movement and other non-governmental organizations;*
 - (f) *Two representatives of the body designated by the Ordinances to represent tertiary level institutions in the Caribbean region;*
 - (g) *One student from each campus elected to the Council pursuant to Statute 44;*

- (h) *One Resident Representative in the Non-Campus Countries elected by them from among their number;*
- (i) *One member of the senior administrative staff elected from among themselves and in such manner as the Ordinances may prescribe; and*
- (j) *One member of other non-academic staff elected from among themselves and in such manner as the Ordinances may prescribe.*

Recommendation 5

The post of Treasurer should be formally abolished. It was never established

See *Statute 18, clause 1 (a)* cited above

Recommendation 6

The post of Pro-Chancellor should be formally abolished

See *Statute 18, clause 1 (a)* cited above

Recommendation 7

The size of the Council should be reduced and the composition should be as follows:

- Chancellor - **Chair**
- Vice-Chancellor (1)
- Campus Principals (3)
- Chairs of the Campus Councils (3)
- University Registrar (1)
- University Bursar (1)
- Chairs of the Boards (3)
- Representatives of governments of contributing countries (15)
- Chancellor's nominees (5) **N.B: to be rotated on a 3-yearly basis**
- Representatives of Academic Boards (4)
- Chair of Committee of Deans (1)
- Representative of the Assoc. of Caribbean Tertiary Institutions (ACTI) (1)
- Alumni representatives (2)
- Guild of Students (3)
- Representative of Senior Administrative & Professional Staff (1)
- Representative of the Administrative, Technical & Service Staff (1)

See *Statute 18, clause 1(a) to (j)* on the composition of Council cited above

Recommendation 9

The category in *Clause 5(g)* of *Ordinance 9* should be eliminated and replaced by the following:

- b) Three (3) persons from the general public with expertise in financial matters to be nominated by the Chancellor

See **Ordinance 9, clause 5(g)**:

5 *The Members of the Finance and General Purposes Committee shall be the following:-*

(g) *One person who is not a member of staff of the University nominated by each Campus Council;*

Recommendation 12

The Strategy Committee should be renamed the “Strategy and Planning Committee”

See **Ordinance 10, clause 1**:

1 *There shall be a Standing Committee of the Council and Senate to be known as the University Strategy Committee.....*

Recommendation 13

The functions of the Committee should be clearly defined to include those set out in *Ordinance 10, Clause 5*; advising on the university’s planning operations and functions; evaluating the university’s Strategic Plan for presentation to Council; evaluating the budgetary implications and monitoring the Plan against its Key Performance Indicators

See **Ordinance 10, clause 5(a) and (b)**:

5 By delegation:-

(a) *from the Senate, the Council and the Campus Councils, the Committee shall prescribe which units of learning or research and which subjects of study shall form part or be the responsibility of each of the Faculties and a unit of learning or research or a subject of study may form part or be the responsibility of more than one Faculty; and*

(b) *from the Senate, the Committee shall discharge the functions of the Senate under Statute 20.1(o).*

Recommendation 15

Ordinance 10, Clause 2 should be modified given that University Council is to be the major forum for making university policy

See **Ordinance 10, clause 2**:

2 *The University Strategy Committee shall function as the crucial policy-making mechanism of the Council with responsibility primarily for strategy and monitoring its implementation of policy adopted by the Council*

Recommendation 17

The composition of the University Strategy and Planning Committee should be as follows:

- Vice-Chancellor (1)
- Chairs of the Boards (3)
- Campus Principals (3)
- University Registrar (1)

- University Bursar (1)
- Representatives of Academic Board (4)
- Chair of the Committee of Deans (1)
- Alumnus representative (1)
- Student representative (1)
- Chancellor's nominees (3) **N.B: to be persons with relevant expertise**
- Head of University Strategic Planning Unit (1)

See **Ordinance 10, clause 1(a) to (l)** on the composition of the Strategy Committee:

- 1 *There shall be a Standing Committee of the Council and Senate to be known as the University Strategy Committee consisting of the following members:-*
 - (a) *The Vice-Chancellor;*
 - (b) *The The Pro-Vice-Chancellors;*
 - (c) *Two persons, not being members of staff of the University, nominated by the Chancellor;*
 - (d) *The Chairs of the Campus Councils;*
 - (e) *The Campus Principals;*
 - (f) *Two members of the Academic Board of each Campus, selected by the Board;*
 - (g) *Three persons representing the Governments of the non-Campus countries selected by the Council from among its members;*
 - (h) *Three persons representing the Governments of the Campus countries selected by the Council from among its members;*
 - (i) *One representative of the post-graduate students selected from among the student representatives on the Board for Graduate Studies and Research;*
 - (j) *One representative of the students selected from among the student representatives on the Board for Undergraduate Studies;*
 - (k) *One representative of the Guild of Graduates;*
 - (l) *The Chancellor, by virtue of office, shall have the right to attend at, and participate in, meetings of the University Strategy Committee.*

Recommendation 18

The functions should remain as outlined in *Statute 21*, but the Task Force has taken note of Campus Council's decision with respect to *Clause 1(k)*

See **Statute 21, clause 1(k)**:

- 1 *Subject to the Charter, these Statutes and the Ordinances a Campus Council shall be a governing body of the University and shall exercise the following powers:*

- (k) *To receive from the Academic Board of its campus estimates of expenditure required to carry out the work of the University at its campus and on behalf of the Council to provide the requisite money in so far as the estimates are approved and accepted by the Campus Council;*

Recommendation 19

The membership of the Campus Councils should remain as currently established, but every deliberate effort must be made to include representation from the NCCs under *Clauses 1(h) of Statute 19*

See *Statute 19, clause 1(h)*:

- 1 *Campus Councils shall be constituted for each of the campuses of the University consisting of the following persons:-*
- (h) *Five persons appointed by the Chancellor from among persons in industry, commerce, the professions, the labour movement and other non-Governmental Organizations in similar fields of endeavour after the Chancellor has consulted with the Chair of the Campus Council;*

Recommendation 20

Statute 21, relating to the Powers of Campus Council be amended such that:

- a) the campus estimates should be generated by the Campus F&GPC to be presented to
the University Council; and
- b) the financial matters pertaining to Fellowships, etc. that are campus specific be delegated fully to the Campus Council

See *Statute 21, clause 1(h)*:

- 1 *Subject to the Charter, these Statutes and the Ordinances a Campus Council shall be a governing body of the University and shall exercise the following powers:*
- (a) *To make the appointments for the Campus as duly authorised;*
- (b) *With the consent of the Academic Board of its campus to institute, confirm, abolish or hold in abeyance any academic or senior office of its campus;*
- (c) *On the recommendation of the Academic Board of its campus to recommend to the Council the creation of new Faculties, whether formed by the subdivision of any one or more than one such existing Faculty, the merging of more than one of any such existing Faculties or otherwise, and the abolition from time to time of any such Faculty;*
- (d) *On the recommendation of the Academic Board of its campus to create and suppress by merger or subdivision Schools, Institutes, Departments, Divisions, Centres and other units of*

- learning or research designated by the Council under Statute 20.1(g) as units of its campus;*
- (e) On behalf of the Council to provide buildings, premises, furniture and equipment and other means required for carrying on the work of the University at its campus;*
 - (f) On behalf of the Council to govern, manage and regulate the finances, accounts, investments and property of the University as shall have been acquired or allocated for the purposes of its campus and for that purpose on the same behalf to appoint bankers and any other officers or agents whom it may deem expedient to appoint;*
 - (g) To determine, after considering the recommendation of the Academic Board of its campus, all University fees, other than tuition and examination fees, for students at its campus;*
 - (h) On behalf of the Council to invest any moneys belonging to the University and acquired or allocated for the purposes of its campus, including any unapplied income, in such stocks, funds, fully paid shares or securities as the Campus Council may from time to time think fit, whether authorised by the general law for the investment of trust moneys or not, or in the purchase of freehold or leasehold hereditaments, including rents, and likewise to vary such investments from time to time by sale or reinvestment or otherwise. Provided that the Campus Council may on the same behalf retain as long as it shall think fit any investment given or bequeathed to the University for the purposes of its campus, although not coming within the description of investments authorised as aforesaid;*
 - (i) Subject to section 2 of this Statute, on behalf of the Council to sell, purchase, exchange, lease, grant or take on lease real and personal property on behalf of the University for the purposes of its campus;*
 - (j) Subject to section 2 of this Statute, on behalf of the Council to borrow money on behalf of the University for the purposes of its campus and for that purpose (if the Campus Council thinks fit) to mortgage or charge all or any part of the property of the University acquired or allocated for the purposes of its campus, unless the conditions of any Will, Deed or Gift or similar instrument are thereby contravened, and to give such other security whether upon real or personal property or otherwise as the Campus Council shall think fit;*
 - (k) To receive from the Academic Board of its campus estimates of expenditure required to carry out the work of the University at its campus and on behalf of the Council to*

provide the requisite money in so far as the estimates are approved and accepted by the Campus Council;

- (l) On behalf of the Council to provide for the welfare of all persons in the employment of the University at its campus or formerly in the employment of the University or of the former University College of the West Indies at its campus and the spouses, surviving spouses and dependants of such persons, including the payment of money, pensions or other payments and on the same behalf to subscribe to benevolent and other funds for the benefit of such persons;*
- (m) On behalf of the Council to enter into, vary, carry out and cancel contracts on behalf of the University in relation to the campus;*
- (n) To recommend to the Senate and Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board of its campus the institution (subject, where appropriate, to any conditions acceptable to the Campus Council and to the Academic Board which might be made by the founders or donors) of Fellowships, Studentships, Scholarships, Exhibitions, Bursaries, Prizes and other aids to study or research for its campus;*
- (o) To promote, and on behalf of the Council to provide for, research at its campus;*
- (p) To take into consideration and, if the Campus Council deems its proper to do so, give effect to or recommend to the Council and the Senate the giving of effect to reports from the Academic Board of its campus on those matters upon which the Academic Board is authorised or required by these Statutes to make reports;*
- (q) To make Orders to govern in the exercise of the preceding powers the members of the University in relation to its campus.*

- 2 The prior approval of the Council shall be required for any sale or other disposition of real property of the University.*
- 3 The limits for expenditure which may be incurred by Campus Councils and Campus Principals without prior approval of the Vice Chancellor shall be established by the Finance and General Purposes Committee, but subject to annual review, and documented in the Financial Code.*

Recommendation 26

The functions of the Board remain the same as in *Statute 28*, but notes that *Clause 3* be amended to reflect the Board's responsibility for assessing the process

See *Statute 28, clause 3*:

- 3 *The Board shall be responsible for managing the process of monitoring the quality of programmes for first degrees, certificates and diplomas other than diplomas designated as advanced diplomas;*

Recommendation 27

The membership of the Board at *Statute 28, Clause 1(c)* should include the Deputy Principal of each campus, two (2) representatives of each Academic Board one of whom must be a Dean and the Chair of the Committee of Deans

See *Statute 28, clause 1(c)*:

- 1 *There shall be a Board for Undergraduate Studies comprising the following persons:-*
 - (c) *Three representatives of each Academic Board;*

Recommendation 32

The Graduate School be disestablished and the relevant *Statute* and *Ordinances* be changed to effect this. The functions assigned to the Board under *Statute 30* may be discharged in the absence of a School

See *Statute 30, clause 1*:

- 1 *There shall be a School for Graduate Studies and Research to be administered by a Board.....*

Recommendation 43

The Board be retained, but the name changed to reflect the use of the term New Campus Countries and should not include Distance Education

See *Statute 29, clause 1*:

There shall be a Board for Non-Campus Countries and Distance Education....

Recommendation 45

Ordinance 47 should be modified to reflect the inclusion of two (2) students nominated by the Presidents of the Guild of Students, at least one of whom must be pursuing a programme in an NCC

See *Ordinance 47*:

The members of the Board for Non-Campus Countries and Distance Education shall pursuant to Statute 29.1(i) include the following:

- (a) *the Director of the Distance Education Unit;*
- (b) *the Head of the Tertiary Level Institutions Unit;*

CONSULTANTS and SUBMISSIONS

CONSULTANTS

The Task Force consulted with:

1. Mr. Lee Sanders, Registrar and Secretary, Durham University, London
2. Dr. John Dixon, Associate Vice-Principal (Academic/International), Queen's University, Canada

SUBMISSIONS

The following provided oral or written submissions:

1. The Hon. Mustapha Abdul-Hamid, Minister of Science, Technology and Tertiary Education, Trinidad & Tobago
2. His Excellency A. Leonard Archer, Chancellor's Nominee, University Council
3. Sir Fitzroy R. Augier, Professor Emeritus, Department of History, Mona
4. Dr. Jeff Atherton, Professor of Tropical Horticulture, Cave Hill
5. Professor Mohammed Bakir, Department of Chemistry, Mona
6. Mrs. Swarna Bandara, Acting Head, Medical Library, Mona
7. Mrs. Gloria P. Barrett Sobers, Director of Administration/University Registrar
8. Professor Christine Barrow, Deputy Principal, Cave Hill
9. Mr. Winston Bayley, Director of Finance/University Bursar
10. Professor Hilary Beckles, Principal and Pro Vice-Chancellor, Cave Hill
11. Dr. George Belle, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, Cave Hill

12. Mr. Kenneth Bobb, Past President, Guild of Students, Cave Hill
13. Mr. Edwin Brandon, Programme Co-ordinator, Office of the Board for Non-Campus Countries & Distance Education, Cave Hill
14. Professor W. Aggrey Brown, Dean, Faculty of Humanities & Education, Mona
15. Miss Roxanne Burton, Representative of the Postgraduate Students, Mona
16. Professor Lawrence Carrington, Pro Vice Chancellor, Office of the Board for Non-Campus Countries & Distance Education
17. Cave Hill Association of Postgraduate Students
18. The Hon. Claris Charles, Minister of Education, Grenada
19. Mr. William Clarke, Chair, Mona Campus Council
20. The Hon Sam T. Condor, Deputy Prime Minister & Minister of Education, Youth, Social & Community Development & Gender Affairs, St. Kitts/Nevis
21. Mr. Damian Crawford, Past President, Guild of Students, Mona
22. Mr. G. E. A. Falloon, Campus Registrar, Mona
23. The Hon. Reginald Farley, Minister of Education, Youth Affairs & Culture, Barbados
24. Dr. Mark Figueroa, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, Mona
25. Professor Henry Fraser, Dean, School of Clinical Medicine & Research, Cave Hill
26. Professor Dennis Gayle, Executive Director, Institute of International Relations, St. Augustine
27. Dr. Hamid A. Ghany, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, St. Augustine
28. Mr. Floyd Green, President, Guild of Students, Cave Hill
29. Dr. Marshall Hall, Chancellor's Nominee, University Council
30. Professor Marlene Hamilton, Pro Vice-Chancellor, Office of Administration & Special Initiatives
31. Professor E. Nigel Harris, Vice-Chancellor

32. The Hon. Maxine Henry Wilson, Minister of Education & Culture, Jamaica
33. Sir Keith D. Hunte, Former Pro Vice-Chancellor and Principal, Cave Hill
34. Professor Wayne Hunte, Pro Vice-Chancellor, Office of Research, St. Augustine
35. Mr. Calvin James, Representative of the Postgraduate Students, St. Augustine
36. The Hon. Bertrand Joseph, Minister of Education, Culture & Technology, Antigua & Barbuda
37. Dame Bernice V. Lake, QC, Chancellor's Nominee, University Council
38. The Hon. Dennis Lalor, Chancellor's Nominee, University Council
39. Professor Elsa Leo-Rhynie, Pro Vice-Chancellor, Office of the Board for Undergraduate Studies
40. Mrs. Luz Longsworth, Resident Tutor, Belize
41. Miss Fallon Lutchmansingh, President, Guild of Students, St. Augustine
42. Dr. Anna Mahase, Chancellor's Nominee, University Council
43. Mr. Michael Mansoor, Chair, St. Augustine Campus Council
44. Professor Simeon McIntosh, Dean, Faculty of Law, Cave Hill
45. Sir Alister McIntyre, Vice-Chancellor Emeritus
46. The Hon. Idabelle Meade, Minister of Education, Health & Community Services, Montserrat
47. The Hon. Mario Michel, Minister of Education, Human Resource Development, Youth & Sports, St. Lucia
48. Mrs. Shirley Miller, QC, Chancellor's Nominee, University Council
49. Professor the Hon. Errol Morrison, Pro Vice-Chancellor, Office of the School for Graduate Studies & Research
50. Professor Leo Moseley, Dean, Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences, Cave Hill
51. Professor the Hon. Rex Nettleford, Vice-Chancellor Emeritus
52. Dr. Ermina Osoba, Resident Tutor, Antigua & Barbuda

53. Dr. Marcia Potter, Resident Tutor, The British Virgin Islands
54. Sir Shridath Ramphal, Chancellor Emeritus
55. Mrs. Elaine Robinson, Campus Bursar, Mona
56. Professor Clement Sankat, Dean, Faculty of Engineering, St. Augustine
57. The Hon. Alfred Sears, Attorney General and Minister of Education, The Bahamas
58. Dr. Hazel Simmons-McDonald, Dean, Faculty of Humanities & Education, Cave Hill
59. Professor Kolawole Soyibo, Deputy Dean (Education), Faculty of Humanities & Education, Mona
60. Mrs. Beverley Steele, Resident Tutor, Grenada
61. Dr. Bhoendradatt Tewarie, Principal and Pro Vice-Chancellor, St. Augustine
62. Mr. Richard Toomer, President, Guild of Students, Mona
63. Professor Lawrence A. Wilson, Professor Emeritus, Department of Food Production, St. Augustine
64. Professor Ronald Young, Dean, Faculty of Pure & Applied Sciences, Mona

DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- Beckles, Hilary (2004, April). *UWI at Risk! GATS/WTO and higher education liberalization in the Caribbean*. Paper presented to the Council Meeting of the University of the West Indies.
- Carrington, L.D (2005). Review of BNCCDE Fulfilment of Remit. Paper presented at meeting of Governance Task Force 2004, UWI, Mona
- Committee of University Chairmen, *et al.* *Guide for Members of Governing Bodies of Universities and Colleges in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*. 3ed.
- Gayle, Dennis J., Tewarie, B. and White, A.Q. (2003). *Governance in the Twenty-First century University*. AHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. Volume 30, Number 1
- Gayle, Dennis J. (2005). Multi-Campus Tertiary Education Systems. Paper presented at meeting of Governance Task Force 2004, UWI, Mona
- Knight, Jane (2002). The impact of trade liberalization on Higher Education: policy Implications. Paper presented at a Conference on *Globalisation: What issues are at stake for universities?* Universite Laval, Quebec, Canada 18 – 21 September.
- Leo-Rhynie, Elsa A. (2004). Prospects and Challenges of the Tertiary Sector. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Joint Committee for Tertiary Education in Jamaica. April.
- Leo-Rhynie, Elsa A., and Carrington, Lawrence D. (2004, January). Summary of the Work of the Task Force established to consider the University College Concept in Relation to the UWI and Tertiary Level Institutions in the Region
- Wade, J. (1997). Organizational change in the University of the West Indies. Master's thesis, University of Manchester, England
- Paper from Board for Non-Campus Countries & Distance Education
- 1) BNCC&DE.P12, 2004/2005: Restructuring of the Outreach Sector
- Papers from meetings of University Council
- 1) C.P9, 1981: University restructuring
 - 2) C.P9A, 1981: Views of the University Academic Committee representing the Senate

- 3) C.P9B, 1981: University restructuring - The position of the government of Trinidad & Tobago
- 4) C.P3, 1982: Summary report of meeting of Ministerial Committee of the University Council held on February 3, 1982
- 5) C.P3A, 1982: WIGUT Mona resolution on restructuring
- 6) C.P3B, 1982: Report of Sub-committee of Council on restructuring
- 7) C.P13, 1982: Report of meeting of Ministerial Committee of the University Council held at the Cunard la Toc Hotel, St. Lucia
- 8) C.P14, 1982: The main stages in University restructuring
- 9) C.P19, 1993 - *Proposal to Review the Governance of the University, July 2, 1993* by the Vice-Chancellor
- 10) CP10A, 1989/90 - *Separation of Central and Campus Administration, May 1988* by Sir Carlisle Burton and Professor Gladstone Mills
- 11) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held April 19, 2002
- 12) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held April 4, 2003
- 13) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held December 13, 2003

Papers from Cave Hill Campus Council

- a) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held March 15, 2002
- b) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held March 19, 2003
- c) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held March 17, 2004

Papers from Mona Campus Council

- a) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held December 11, 2002
- b) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held March 7, 2003
- c) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held March 19, 2004

Papers from St. Augustine Campus Council

- a) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held March 19, 2002
- b) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held March 17, 2003
- c) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held March 29, 2004

Papers from Finance and General Purposes Committee, Cave Hill

- a) Agenda of meeting to be held May 20, 2003
- b) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held January 29, 2004
- c) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held May 28, 2004

Papers from Finance and General Purposes Committee, Mona

- a) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held June 21, 2004
- b) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held July 26, 2004
- c) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held September 3, 2004

Papers from Finance and General Purposes Committee, St. Augustine

- a) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held September 18, 2003
- b) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held November 28, 2003
- c) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held January 23, 2004

- d) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held February 27, 2004
- e) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held June 25, 2004
- f) Agenda of meeting held October 8, 2004

Papers from University Finance & General Purposes Committee

- a) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held February 6, 2004
- b) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held May 21, 2004
- c) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held October 15, 2004

Papers from University Strategy Committee

- a) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held April 17 and 18, 2002
- b) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held April 3, 2003
- c) Agenda and Minutes of meeting held April 22, 2004

Role Statement: The Role of the Vice-Chancellor in Governance.

http://www.policies.curtin.edu.au/documents/role_of_vice-chancellor_in_gov.doc.
Accessed in September 2004.

The University of the West Indies. (2003). *The UWI Strategic Plan II – 2002-2007*

The University of the West Indies. (1999). *The Charter Statutes and Ordinances*, Vol. II.
University Printers

The University of the West Indies. (1998). *The Charter Statutes and Ordinances*, Vol. I.
University Printers

The University of the West Indies. (1998, August). Organogram of the UWI
Management Structure

The University of the West Indies. (1998, August). Organogram of the UWI the Vice-
Chancellery

The University of the West Indies. (1996, August). Organogram of the UWI Governance
Structure

The University of the West Indies (1994). *A New Structure: The Regional University in
the 1990s and Beyond*. Report of the Chancellor's Commission on the Governance
of the UWI, July 1994. Petrel & Porpoise Design, Coventry, England

The University of the West Indies. *Commission on Governance - Implementation
Committee's Report to University Council*

- i. Recommendations on Undergraduate Studies
- ii. Recommendations on Graduate Studies
- iii. Recommendations on Student Relations
- iv. Recommendations on Communications
- v. Recommendations on Ordinance 8

- vi. Recommendations on Board for Non-Campus Countries and Distance Education
- vii. Recommendations on Finance & Planning
- viii. Central University Bodies

The UWI Financial Reports

Office of Finance. (2005, September). *Funding of Graduate Programmes*, Paper presented at meeting of the Governance Task Force 2004

School for Graduate Studies and Research. *Unlocking Caribbean Potential*, April 2005, 3ed., Pear Tree Press, Jamaica

Management Audit Department. (2005, February). *A paper on the University's Audit entities and their contribution to the work of its governing bodies*. Paper presented at meeting of the Governance Task Force 2004

MEETINGS OF THE TASK FORCE

- 1. Thursday, October 28, 2004 at St. Augustine**
- 2. Wednesday, February 23, 2005 and Thursday, February 24, 2005 at Mona**
- 3. Saturday, April 9, 2005 at Mona**
- 4. Thursday, May 12, 2005 and Friday, May 13, 2005 at Cave Hill**
- 5. Monday, June 27, 2005 and Tuesday, June 28, 2005 at Mona**
- 6. Friday, October 7, 2005 and Saturday, October 8, 2005 at St. Augustine**
- 7. Monday, January 16, 2006 and Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at Mona**