



Carleton University acknowledges and respects the Algonquin people, traditional custodian of the land on which the Carleton University campus is situated.

**Carleton University Senate
Meeting of October 19, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.
Senate Room, Robertson Hall
AGENDA**

**Note that for this meeting the Closed Session will follow the Open Session.*

Open Session:

1. Welcome

2. Approval of Agenda (open)

3. Minutes:

a) September 28, 2018

4. Matters Arising

- a. Library Committee Follow-up (Clerk)
- b. DUC Equity Policy (J. Tomberlin)
- c. SRC Chair / Committee memberships / process (Clerk)
- d. Clerk Selection process (J. Tomberlin)

5. Chair's Remarks

6. Question Period

7. Senate Administration: (Clerk)

- a. Senate and Committee membership ratifications
- b. Convocation Date for Fall 2021

8. Reports:

- a. SAPC (J. Tomberlin)
- b. SCCASP (H. Nemiroff)

9. Task Force on Free Speech Policy (Clerk)

10. Reports for Information:

- a. Senate Executive Committee Minutes (September 18, 2018)

11. Other Business



Carleton University acknowledges and respects the Algonquin people, traditional custodian of the land on which the Carleton University campus is situated.

**Carleton University Senate
Meeting of September 28, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.
Senate Room, Robertson Hall**

MINUTES

Attending: F. Afagh, S. Ajila, A. Angulo, B.A. Bacon (Chair), T. Bazinet, S. Blanchard, S. Boyle, J. Coghill, B. Creary, C. Cruickshank, C. Dion, A. Dodge, D. Dranunoiu, L. Dyke, J. Erochko, M. Esponda, K. Evans, P. Farrell, R. Goubran, E. Grant, N. Grasse, P. Gunupudi, H. Gupta, A. Harrison, J. Hayes, W. Horn, B. Hughes, W. Jones, J. Kovalio, S. Kroff, B. Kuzmarov (Clerk), E. Kwan (also serving as Proxy for L. Schweitzer), P. Lagasse, Yiqiang Zaho (Proxy for C. Macdonald), A. Maheshwari, R. Mackay, M. Neufang, D. Nussbaum, D. Oladejo, J. Paulson, M. Piché, C. Worswick (proxy for A. Plourde), B. Popplewell, M. Qalinle, M. Brklacich (Proxy for P. Rankin), M. Rooney, W. Shi, A. Shotwell, E. Sloan, P. Smith, T. Tandon, J. Tomberlin, C. Trudel, C. Viju, K. von Finckenstein, J.P. Watzlawik-Li, J. Wolfart,

Regrets: A. Bowker, A. Chandler, J. Cheetham, T. Di Leo Browne, B. Hallgrímsson, A. Hassan, F. Hosseinian, D. Howe, C. Joslin, S. Klausen, J. Liu, N. Nanos, H. Nemiroff, J. Ramasubramanyam, S. Shires, D. Siddiqi, J. Smith, J. Stoner

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

Open Session:

1. Welcome and Introduction of New Members

President Bacon welcomed all to the first Senate meeting of 2018-19 and introduced himself as the new Chair of Senate. New members were also introduced and welcomed to the group.

2. Approval of Agenda

It was **MOVED** (E. Grant, C. Dion) that Senate approve the open agenda for the meeting of Senate on September 28, 2018, as presented.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Discussion: A Senator inquired about a number of items that he expected to see on the agenda:

- Election of the Clerk of Senate - The Provost promised a fulsome answer at the next meeting regarding the process of electing the new Clerk of Senate.
- Smudging - The Clerk addressed the question about smudging, an

Indigenous practice which had been incorporated into Senate in 2017-18. As there are no Indigenous members sitting on Senate this year, it would not be appropriate to include smudging at Senate, as it is a religious practice. The Clerk and Chair are consulting with Equity Services and the Centre for Indigenous Initiatives to explore ways that Indigenous practices could be incorporated in Senate in a respectful manner.

- Matters Arising (from the minutes) - The Chair agreed that Matters Arising could be incorporated into the discussion of the minutes of the previous Senate meeting (Item 3 on the agenda).

3. **Approval of Minutes:** June 1, 2018 (open session)

It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, J. Paulson) that Senate approve the minutes of the Senate meeting on June 1, 2018 (open session) as presented.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

Matters Arising Discussion: Senators asked for follow-up to the following items from the June 1st minutes:

- SMA3 Update (Provost): Joint initiatives - *Education City Pilot Project* funded by the province – The presidents and provosts of the four post-secondary institutions in Ottawa met last year to discuss collaborative initiatives for the Education City Pilot Project. Plans are preliminary at this point but include many interesting ideas that will contribute to Carleton's research agendas, the success of our students, and the economic health of Ottawa. One “research shop” has been established in Kanata; other potential locations are being considered at Bayview Yards, Orleans and/or the Dominion Chalmers United Church. The joint meeting of the four institutions mentioned in the minutes from June 1 has been scheduled for November 9. Logistical details are being finalized and communications will be released soon. Vice-Provost L. Dyke will be the point person at Carleton for this initiative.
Carleton and its partner institutions continue to explore ways to collaborate with Indigenous communities, and to share services and resources in order to build efficiencies and resiliencies. Regular reports on these initiatives will be made to Senate moving forward.
- E-votes and AGU Revision Update: The AGU revisions, including the newly added e-vote procedure, received final approval by the Board of Governors in June.

- Senate Review Committee status and work plan: The Senate Review Committee will meet and begin its work once a Chair has been nominated and approved by Senate.
- SCCASP review of student amnesty /accommodation motion: This is on the agenda for the next SCCASP meeting, and will be reported to Senate in October.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair provided an update on his activities on campus over the past three months. Important Carleton news items during this time include:

- the launch of the David C. Onley initiative (branded under Education City) to enhance employment opportunities for people with disabilities (with 4 partners in Ottawa).
- Four visits by Minister McKenna to campus, with government funding for research into energy conservation and autonomous vehicles.
- The expansion of the Therapy Dogs Program, with 7 therapy dogs now holding office hours on campus. It was noted that all of these are family dogs belonging to Carleton staff and faculty.
- A large SSHRCC partnership grant of \$3.6M, secured by Professor James Milner and his team, to study global refugee issues. This is important research with global impact.
- The recent tornados in Ottawa. Although the campus was spared, many members of our community were impacted. Assistance was offered in the form of showers, food and some accommodations.
- A report on enrollment that shows first-year enrollment slightly down for the first time in many years. Application and offer numbers were higher, but due to the labour disruptions last spring follow-through for first-year applicants was impacted. Overall enrollment was up by 1%.
- Confirmation of the intention to review Carleton's Sexual Violence Policy. The process will be as broad and consultative as possible, and a revised policy will be completed in the Spring.
- The launch of the search for a new Provost. Input has been received from the campus community and an ad will be posted shortly. To bring Carleton in line with best practices across Canada, the Provost, as Chief Academic Officer, will also act as Chief Budget Officer to ensure that the resource allocation process is closely aligned with Carleton's academic mission. This change will be made effective immediately. The budget will continue to be presented at Senate.

- The passing of Clayton Riddell, a major donor to Carleton. Mr. Riddell, a philanthropist based in Calgary, made the largest donation in Carleton's history to support the graduate program in political management. The flag was lowered to half-mast in his honour earlier in the week.

5. Question Period

Four questions on three topics were submitted in advance and answered at the Senate meeting.

a) Student Evaluations of Teaching

What changes concerning student evaluations of teaching (SETs), if any, will the university consider in light of the recent arbitration decision at Ryerson University (<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onla/doc/2018/2018canlii58446/2018canlii58446.html>), which found that SETs are "flawed, while the use of averages is fundamentally and irreparably flawed"? Teaching evaluations are, of course, collectively bargained matters, but it would seem that change is coming one way or another. Would it not make more sense for the university to be proactive in this matter, instead of waiting for an inevitable legal challenge that, based on the Ryerson precedent, would force that change?

The Provost provided an answer to this question. Although the Ryerson decision is influential in understanding best practices, it has not necessarily set a precedent for other universities. The situation at Carleton differs in many respects from Ryerson. A new student evaluation will be piloted this winter with recommendations moving forward from a joint CUASA-Management committee. The committee also will be recommending the use of a teaching dossier, mentioned in the new Collective Agreement, which provides a more complete picture of teachers' profile than the student evaluations. Finally, the new Collective Agreement mandates the use of a rich set of descriptive statistics to provide a more comprehensive analysis of teaching performance.

CUASA and Senior Administrators were recognized and thanked for being proactive on this question.

Follow – up on this issue can be provided at a future Senate meeting.

b) Library – Recent Changes to Collections and Services (2 questions)

Recently, the library has undertaken a targeted cull of thousands of volumes in particular areas of Carleton's collection. The removal of these volumes would constitute to a significant change in academic services and programming

capacity at Carleton and, as such, fall well within Senate's academic purview. Indeed, the Terms of Reference for the Senate Library Committee – a Standing Committee of Senate – state that the SLC is to advise and make recommendation to the library in areas including (but not limited to) “development of the University collection” and “services offered.” According to the same Terms of Reference, SLC is responsible to Senate alone.

[\(https://carleton.ca/senate/standing-committees/library/\)](https://carleton.ca/senate/standing-committees/library/)

Questions: Was the SLC informed of plans for these significant changes to collections and services? When was the SLC informed of these changes? What, if any, recommendations did SLC make to the library regarding these changes?

The Library has apparently begun a mass culling of thousands of books and materials. FASS is concerned that this is occurring without sufficient consultations nor considerations for the impact on future research in particular disciplines. As a rule, we do not believe that the importance of maintaining an item in a library collection is measurable by how often it has been checked out or referenced—such criteria simply lead to scholarship that reproduces itself, rather than allowing for new knowledge-creation. Our understanding, however, is that the principal criterion for disposal of material is indeed whether or not a book has been recently checked out. Because of the significant impact on academic work at Carleton, this surely falls under the purview of Senate, and such a policy needs to be brought before Senate, debated, and approved before it can go ahead. When will the Senate Library Committee bring such a proposal to Senate for debate? And will the mass disposal of material be postponed until Senate approves such a policy?

The University Librarian spoke to this item:

Context on “Weeding:” Weeding in libraries is a common, regular practice and is not unusual. Libraries are not able to keep all of the books they acquire over the years. Carleton’s MacOdrum Library typically adds 12,000 to 14,000 volumes per year to the 1.5M books already in the collection. Highly used materials are housed in the library, and secondary materials are kept in a large storage facility near the Ice House. Items from this facility can be retrieved for use within a few hours, although it is not possible to browse these shelves. Some materials do need to be permanently removed and discarded on a regular basis.

Background on Senate Library Committee: The Senate Library Committee is chaired by a faculty member, and is composed of line faculty representatives, library staff and student representatives. It meets twice a year (once per term) and acts both as an advisory committee, and a

means of reporting out on library activities and news. The committee should report to Senate at least once per year, although in the past this has not always been the case.

The Senate Library Committee did not meet in Winter 2018 and they were not informed of the weeding planned for April/May that is mentioned in the question. The library does not typically seek approval from Senate for regular weeding, but is responsive to concerns expressed by departments that may arise from this practice. For example, the library has been consulting with the English department about the large number of English books on the current discard list, which is a result of a lack of weeding for a number of years.

The University Librarian also mentioned other options for obtaining discarded materials, such as Inter-Library Loans and electronic versions, which are becoming more common.

Discussion:

Several Senators expressed concern about this current practice and asked if there is a policy which defines which library materials are kept and which are discarded.

The University Librarian responded that criteria for weeding is based on borrowing time. Books in the Arts & Social Sciences that have not been checked out in 20+ years, for example, would be candidates for removal.

A Senator questioned whether or not this rule/criterion belongs to a specific policy that has been brought to Senate for approval. Books and collections are fundamental to teaching and research and are at the core of academic matters. Changes to collections can impact a department's ability to deliver certain programs, and so should have Senate oversight.

Another Senator noted that the role of the SLC as defined in its Terms of Reference is "to advise and make recommendations" to the library, but this cannot occur if the SLC does not meet regularly and is not informed of plans to make major changes to collections.

The Chair confirmed the following Action Items arising from the discussion:

- **Search records for a policy on library collections management, note if/when it was approved by Senate, then refer the matter back to the Senate Library Committee.**
- **Refer this question and issue(s) to the Senate Library Committee for a fulsome discussion, then have SLC report back to Senate.**

c) Experiential Learning

The way experiential learning is defined is causing some consternation among FASS faculty. I don't recall Senate discussing any policy regarding how experiential learning is measured, but it has come to our attention that much of what FASS does is not seen as experiential learning — apparently on disciplinary grounds, rather than through any rigorous criterion of whether or not students gain useful experience in a course — and that someone is making rather arbitrary decisions in the categorization of courses as being with or without experiential learning that could become consequential, should the Province decide to tie funding to experiential learning content. How is experiential learning content currently defined? As this is in the purview of Senate, will such a policy be immediately reviewed, with input from all Deans and their respective Faculty Boards, and be brought before Senate for discussion and approval?

The Vice-Provost provided an answer to this question.

Experiential Learning is a part of Carleton's mission statement; it is included in our Strategic Integrated Plan and teaching framework.

Current questions around experiential learning are being driven by Ministry requirements. In round 2 of the Strategic Mandate Agreements, all universities were asked to discuss how they are addressing Experiential Learning. In September of 2017, the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD) issued guidelines for Experiential Learning that included a typology of acceptable types of EL and a checklist of 6 criteria that activities must meet to be considered EL. These communications revealed the Ministry's narrow and restrictive definition of Experiential Learning. Subsequent discussions between the Ministry and COU suggest a high probability that the number of EL activities per student will be a metric in SMA3.

Since Carleton will begin to develop SMA3 in the Fall of 2019, all experiential learning is being reviewed, and preliminary data is being collected to develop a benchmark for setting SMA3 targets.

A 12-member Steering Committee on Experiential Learning was formed in the Winter 2018 term, to develop Carleton University definitions of EL types, using the MAESD typology. There is sector-wide concern that much of what we do may not count as EL by the Ministry's definition. The Council of Ontario Universities Task Force on Quality Indicators is working with the Ministry to attempt to broaden the typology, but ultimately the Ministry will dictate what counts as EL.

Ministry and CU Steering Committee definitions have been posted on the Carleton University Provost's website.

Currently there is an initiative to tag courses for EL in order to prepare for Ministry reporting. Existing courses are being coded by OVPAVPA, based on calendar descriptions. Academic units then review and verify the preliminary coding.

Two other initiatives around Experiential Learning are planned. The Steering Committee has recommended that Carleton adopt a Degree Level Expectation around experiential learning. All programs are currently accountable for meeting 6 provincial DLEs. This would be a Carleton University specific DLE requiring that: *Every student will demonstrate the ability to reflect on purposeful learning experiences and apply practical skills and knowledge in appropriate contexts that prepare students for the workplace and civil society.* (proposed wording)

This initiative would involve broad consultations across campus – with Deans, Chairs & Directors, and Full Faculty Boards – before ultimately coming to Senate for approval.

Finally, a University wide symposium on Experiential Learning is scheduled for Oct 23. The symposium will focus on best practices plus the opportunities and challenges of experiential learning for student success. So far, 41 proposals on Carleton initiatives have been received, 25% of them from FASS.

6. Senate Administration (Clerk):

a) Senate and Senate Committee Membership Ratification

The Clerk of Senate presented a list of nominees for Senate and Senate Standing Committees that had come to the Senate Office over the summer (after the close of the Call for Nominations).

It was **MOVED** (S. Blanchard, E. Sloan) that Senate ratify the new Senate and Senate Committee appointments, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

b) Ratification of CUCQA Membership

It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, L. Dyke) that Senate ratify the membership of the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance, as presented.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

c) Report on the Empowering Motion

The Clerk reported that several actions were taken after June 1 under the standing empowering motion, including recommendations for graduation, one recommendation for a certificate of outstanding achievement plus decisions regarding Senate and Senate Committee membership. All of the details can be found in the Senate Executive minutes included in the Reports for Information.

7. Reports:

a) SAPC – Senate Academic Program Committee (J. Tomberlin)

J. Tomberlin introduced motions to ratify reports from Cyclical Reviews of three programs.

It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, P. Smith) that Senate ratify the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate programs in Chemistry. The Provost noted one correction to be made in the document on page 19, where the date for reception/approval by CUCQA should be August 22 and not September 12.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY** with this correction.

It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, L. Dyke) that Senate ratify the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the graduate programs in Philosophy (Dominican University College).

Discussion: A Senator noted in Item 7 of the recommendations for improvement: *That DUC make every effort as soon as possible to hire with non-discriminatory procedures at least one new female faculty member, even if only initially at an annual renewable contractual level.* The language of this recommendation suggests that there could be an equity issue. The Chair and Provost agreed that this issue needs to be addressed, but suggested that Senate ratify the cyclical review, then bring Senate's concerns about equity in hiring back to the DUC leadership for further discussion.

The motion **PASSED**.

Vote Count:

21 yes

5 no

3 abstain

It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, E. Sloan) that Senate ratify the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Women's and Gender Studies. One Senator noted some inconsistencies with formatting in the documentation and asked that these be corrected.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY** with these editorial changes.

8. Reports for Information:

a) Senate Executive Minutes: May 22, 2018, June 12, 2018 + E-polls from Summer 2018

There was no discussion.

9. Process towards Free Speech Policy

The Chair began with a brief introduction to the Ministry's news release "Upholding Free Speech on Ontario's University and College Campuses." This directive from the Premier's Office requires all colleges and universities

in Ontario to develop and post a free speech policy with specified minimum standards by Jan 1, 2019.

The majority of those discussing this directive at the Council of Ontario Universities feel that freedom of expression and free speech is a deeply academic issue. The Chair agrees with this assessment, and believes that the right venue to address this issue is Senate.

Pending Senate approval, the Chair proposed the creation of a small task force of Senators, led by the Clerk of Senate, to generate a first draft of the policy. This draft would then be brought to the next meeting of Senate on October 19th for fulsome discussion.

The Chair proposed the following process:

- Senators interested in serving on the Task Force would submit an Expression of Interest to the Assistant University Secretary by Tuesday October 2nd.
- Membership of the Task Force would include 3 faculty members and 2 students (one undergraduate and one graduate).
- Task Force members would be confirmed by Senate Executive Committee on Wednesday October 3rd.
- The Task Force would meet on October 5 and October 12 to draft the policy.
- The draft policy would be brought to Senate on October 19 for discussion, then circulated to the broader community for input.

Discussion:

A Senator asked if an extension of the January 1st deadline might be possible. Because this Free Speech Policy will interact with existing policies on campus (such as equity policies, and policies of academic freedom in the Collective Agreement) and it will require review by legal counsel, the timeline proposed by the government seems unworkable.

The Chair responded that an extension might be possible, but it would not be advisable to request it immediately. To minimize potential contradictions with existing and related campus policies, a simple statement of policy (a “min specs” approach) is recommended.

Several Senators suggested that a Contract Instructor be added to the Task Force as a 6th member. The suggestion was supported by the Chair. The membership was adjusted to include 3 faculty members, 1 Contract Instructor and 2 students.

It was also suggested that Senate be allowed to vote on the membership. The Clerk and Assistant University Secretary agreed that if all Expressions of Interest could be received by October 2nd, an online election could be scheduled by the Senate Office for Wednesday October 3. The membership would then be confirmed in time for the first meeting on Friday October 5.

A Senator asked if existing policies at other universities, perhaps in the United States, could be used as a template for Carleton's policy. The Chair responded that although the COU discussed developing a template, some universities were not comfortable with this approach. Policies at American universities also operate under a different legislative framework under the first amendment. Although it is mentioned in the Ministry's directive, the University of Chicago Statement on Principles of Free Expression is not directly applicable because Ontario universities work under a legal framework that includes Ontario Human Rights law. Carleton will need to develop a policy that is in line with these values and procedures.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Senators approved the proposed timeline and revised process by general consensus. The Chair asked Senators to submit Expressions of Interest to the Assistant University Secretary by noon on Tuesday October 2nd, and to be prepared to vote in an online election to choose the Task Force membership on Wednesday October 3rd. The members of the Task Force (3 faculty members, 1 contract instructor, 1 undergraduate student and 1 graduate student, all Senators) will be confirmed on Thursday October 4th and the first meeting will be held on October 5th. After its second meeting on October 12, the Task Force will bring a draft Free Speech Policy to Senate on October 19th for fulsome discussion and revision.

The Chair thanked Senators for their input and contributions to this process.

10. Other Business

There was none.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Senators were invited to attend a post-meeting Senate Mixer in RO617.

DRAFT

Senate Committee Membership Ratifications

October 19, 2018

MOTION: That Senate approve the following new Senate and Senate Committee appointments, as presented.

Senate Executive Committee

- Emily Grant (Undergraduate Student member)

Senate Academic Program Committee (SAPC)

- Beverly Osazuwa (Undergraduate Student member)
- Zaiyaan Esoof (Undergraduate Student member)

Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admission and Studies Policy (SCCASP)

- Bijan Toufighi (Sprott faculty representative)
- Shay Ishola (Undergraduate Student member)
- Afreen Ahmad (Undergraduate Student member)

Senate Academic Governance Committee

- Icarpson Fabrice Joseph (Undergraduate Student member)

Senate Library Committee

- Reid Smith (Undergraduate Student member)

Senate Honorary Degrees Committee

- Ken Lumsden (Undergraduate Student member)

Senate Educational Equity Committee

- Susan Ajibowu (Undergraduate Student member)

Senate Student Academic Integrity Appeals Committee

- Alaa Sarji (Undergraduate Student member)
- Bashar Hnidi (Undergraduate Student member)

Senate Review Committee

- Dami Fakolujo (Undergraduate Student member)

DATE: October 12, 2018

TO: Senate

FROM: Dr. Jerry Tomberlin, Interim Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and Chair,
Senate Academic Program Committee

RE: Human Computer Interaction – **Governance**

SAPC Motion

THAT SAPC recommends to Senate the approval of the proposed change in governance to Human Computer Interaction to take effect upon approval.

Senate Motion

THAT Senate approve the proposed change in governance to Human Computer Interaction as presented to take effect upon approval.

Background

There are three core academic units currently designated: Computer Science, Information Technology, and Psychology, and the governance of the program involves these three units. Since the program began in 2012, changes in faculty have led to a reduced interest from the Department of Psychology, and increased interest from the Institute of Cognitive Science. It is therefore proposed that the governance structure be changed to replace the participation from Psychology with participation from Cognitive Science. Letters of support have been provided by each of the affected units.

Attachments

Proposal for Amendment to Governance Structure

DATE: October 12, 2018

TO: Senate

FROM: Dr. Jerry Tomberlin, Interim Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and Chair,
Senate Academic Program Committee

RE: MA & Graduate Diplomas in Migration and Diaspora Studies – **New Program Approval**

SAPC Motion

THAT SAPC recommends to Senate the approval of the proposed MA and Graduate Diplomas in Migration and Diaspora Studies programs to commence with effect from Fall 2019.

Senate Motion

THAT Senate approve the proposed MA and Graduate Diplomas in Migration and Diaspora Studies programs to commence with effect from Fall 2019.

Background

These programs will be the first graduate-level programs in Canada to combine Migration Studies with Diaspora Studies. These interdisciplinary programs will also be unique in that they aim to combine academic studies in Migration and Diaspora Studies with practical experience in these fields.

Senators will note that the self-study (Appendix A) contains additions and changes using track changes. The tracked changes represent the unit's responses to the recommendations of the external reviewers and/or university committees. The Quality Council Appraisal Committee appreciates seeing easily identifiable evidence that the program champions have responded to the internal and external reviews.

Attachments

- Appendix A: Self-Study with Appendices
- Appendix B: Discussant's Report
- Appendix C: Site Visit Agenda and Brief Biographies of External Reviewers
- Appendix D: External Reviewers' Report
- Appendix E: Response to the External Reviewers' Report
- Appendix F: Discussant's Final Recommendation Report
- Appendix G: Recommendation from the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance
- Appendix H: Courseleaf Entries

Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)

Upon the above motion being passed by Senate, the required documentation will be submitted to the Quality Council for its review and a decision on whether the MA and Graduate Diplomas in Migration and Diaspora Studies programs will be authorized to commence.

DATE: October 12, 2018

TO: Senate

FROM: Dr. Jerry Tomberlin, Interim Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and Chair,
Senate Academic Program Committee

RE: MA and Graduate Diploma in Linguistics; PHD in Linguistics, Language Documentation, and
Revitalization – **New Program Approval**

SAPC Motion

THAT SAPC recommends to Senate the approval of the proposed MA and Graduate Diploma in Linguistics and the PHD in Linguistics, Language Documentation, and Revitalization programs to commence with effect from Fall 2019.

Senate Motion

THAT Senate approve the proposed MA and Graduate Diploma in Linguistics and the PHD in Linguistics, Language Documentation, and Revitalization programs to commence with effect from Fall 2019.

Background

These programs will reflect the evolution of linguistics from a theoretical model of linguistic knowledge to an interdisciplinary field concerned with language in cognitive and social domains. They will draw on the strengths of the linguistics faculty who have strong backgrounds in theoretical linguistics and are involved in interdisciplinary research and teaching.

Senators will note that the self-study (Appendix A) contains additions and changes using track changes. The tracked changes represent the unit's responses to the recommendations of the external reviewers and/or university committees. The Quality Council Appraisal Committee appreciates seeing easily identifiable evidence that the program champions have responded to the internal and external reviews.

Attachments

- Appendix A: Self-Study with Appendices
- Appendix B: Discussant's Report
- Appendix C: Site Visit Agenda and Brief Biographies of External Reviewers
- Appendix D: External Reviewers' Report
- Appendix E: Response to the External Reviewers' Report
- Appendix F: Discussant's Final Recommendation Report
- Appendix G: Recommendation from the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance
- Appendix H: Courseleaf Entries

Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)

Upon the above motion being passed by Senate, the required documentation will be submitted to the Quality Council for its review and a decision on whether the MA and Graduate Diploma in Linguistics and

the PHD in Linguistics, Language Documentation, and Revitalization programs will be authorized to commence.



MEMORANDUM

From the Senate Committee on
Curriculum, Admission and Studies Policy

To: Senate
From: Howard Nemiroff, Chair of SCCASP
Date: October 19, 2018
Subject: 19-20 Academic Regulations Changes

For Senate approval:

1. Experiential learning Calendar notation

Motion: That Senate approve that the Undergraduate Calendar entry for courses with an Experiential learning activity will include the following statement: "Includes: Experiential Learning Activity" for the 2019/20 Calendar

- Attachment: *EL description in Cal*

2. Reg 2.4.5 revisions

Motion: That Senate approve the revisions to Reg 2.4.5 for the 2019/20 Calendar as presented.

- Attachment: *TBD-1421 R-UG-2.4*

3. Reg 2.1, 2.2.4 Course outline

Motion: That Senate approve the revisions to Reg 2.1 and 2.2.4 for the 2019/20 Calendar as presented

- Attachments: *TBD-1417 R-UG-2.0*

Update

Amnesty Motion

BIOL 1104 [0.5 credit]

Foundations of Biology II

A research-oriented course focusing on the scientific process of biological exploration at the macroscale. Topics include evolution, diversity of life, and ecological relationships.

Includes: Experiential Learning activity

Precludes additional credit for BIOL 1004 (no longer offered).

Prerequisite(s): Ontario 4U/M in Biology (or equivalent) or [BIOL 1103](#).

Lectures three hours a week, laboratory or tutorial three hours a week.

Date Submitted: 10/11/18 8:30 pm

Viewing: **TBD-1421 : R-UG-2.4 Examination Regulations**

Last approved: 02/21/18 9:09 am

Last edit: 10/11/18 8:30 pm

Last modified by: dottynwakanma

Changes proposed by: dottynwakanma

In Workflow

1. **REGS RO UG Review**
2. PRE SCCASP
3. SCCASP
4. Senate
5. CalEditor

Approval Path

1. 09/28/18 3:17 pm
Mary Au (maryau):
Rollback to Initiator
2. 10/02/18 9:21 am
Mike Labreque
(mikelabreque): Rollback
to Initiator

History

1. Mar 1, 2016 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
2. May 20, 2016 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
3. Mar 20, 2017 by Mike Labreque (mikelabreque)
4. Jun 12, 2017 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
5. Feb 21, 2018 by Mike Labreque (mikelabreque)

Calendar Pages Using this Program [Course Evaluation](#)

Effective Date 2019-20

Workflow **majormod** ~~minormod~~

Program Code TBD-1421

Level Undergraduate

Faculty Not Applicable

Academic Unit Regulations: RO

Degree

Title R-UG-2.4 Examination Regulations

Program Requirements

2.4 Examination Regulations

Students writing tests and examinations should be aware of the rules governing examination conduct. These rules include those listed in the Academic Integrity section of this Calendar and information about policy and procedures for writing examinations distributed at the final examination.

For examinations scheduled during the official examination period, it may be necessary to schedule examinations during the day for classes held in the evening and vice versa, or on Saturday and Sunday.

All tests and examinations are subject to the following rules:

1. Tests or examinations given in class may not exceed the time allotted for the class;
2. The schedule for any term tests or examinations to be held outside class time must be communicated in the course outline. Students who are unable to write during this scheduled time must be accommodated before the last day of classes.
3. If there is a final examination in the summer term, it will be held during the official examination period;
4. If there is a final examination or an end-of-term examination in a multi-term course, this examination will be held in the official examination period;
5. No summative tests or final examinations may be held during the last two weeks of fall or winter terms, or during the last week of each half of the summer **term. Please note that practical exams, where the material cannot be tested during formal examination period, are exempt from this rule provided (i) students are made aware of the practical exam requirement at the start of the term via the course outline, and (ii) the examination contributes to no more than 15% of the final grade. If provision (i) above is met but the examination comprises more than 15% of the final grade, Dean approval is required prior to informing students via the course outline. term;**
6. Formative tests or examinations may be held during the last two weeks of classes of fall or winter terms, or during the last week of each half of the summer term, provided they do not total more than 15% of the final grade. The purpose of formative tests or examinations is to provide feedback to students on a component of the course content.
7. No tests or examinations may be held between the end of classes in a term and the beginning of formally scheduled examinations;
8. Normally, final take-home examinations in any term will be assigned on or before the last day of classes and are due on the last day of the official examination period. Final take-home examinations not set according to this normal practice must be formally scheduled by Scheduling and Examination Services and are subject to overload rules. In all cases the rules for take-home examinations must be well communicated to students by course instructors.
9. Students are not required to write with an exam conflict (defined as two examinations scheduled at the same time) nor in an exam overload, defined as (i) 3 or more examinations scheduled in 3 consecutive time slots, (ii) 4 or more examinations scheduled in 5 consecutive time slots, or (iii) 5 or more examinations scheduled in 7 consecutive time slots, where a time slot refers to the morning, afternoon, or evening time slot on an exam day.

New Resources

No New Resources

Summary

To accommodate courses that cannot be written during exam period

Rationale for change

Transition/Implementation

Program reviewer comments

mikelabreque (09/18/18 9:45 am): Correcting effective term.
maryau (09/28/18 3:17 pm): Rollback: At request from Dotty to make changes.
mikelabreque (10/02/18 9:21 am): Rollback: Rollback to incorporate SCCASP edits.

Date Submitted: 09/28/18 3:38 pm

Viewing: **TBD-1417 : R-UG-2.0 Course Evaluation (incl. 2.1, 2.2, 2.2.1)**

Last approved: 04/06/18 9:09 am

Last edit: 09/28/18 3:38 pm

Last modified by: dottynwakanma

Changes proposed by: dottynwakanma

In Workflow

1. **REGS RO UG Review**
2. PRE SCCASP
3. SCCASP
4. Senate
5. CalEditor

History

1. Mar 1, 2016 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
2. May 20, 2016 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
3. Apr 6, 2018 by Mike Labreque (mikelabreque)

Calendar Pages Using this Program [Course Evaluation](#)

Effective Date	2019-20
Workflow	majormod
Program Code	TBD-1417
Level	Undergraduate
Faculty	Not Applicable
Academic Unit	Regulations: RO
Degree	
Title	R-UG-2.0 Course Evaluation (incl. 2.1, 2.2, 2.2.1)

Program Requirements

2.0 Course Evaluation

2.1 Credit

To obtain credit in a course, students must **satisfy** ~~meet all~~ the course requirements ~~for attendance, term work and examinations~~ as published in the course outline.

2.2 The Course Outline

The instructor is required to provide a formal statement to students called the Course Outline. The course outline must be made available to all Carleton students registered in that course, on or before the required date found in the schedule for The Academic Year, normally one week prior to the start of a term.

The course outline must specify:

1. Complete calendar description.
2. Proposed list of topics to be covered.
3. Mandatory Required Materials to be acquired.
4. All the elements that will contribute to the final grade and the overall approximate grade breakdown for the course. The elements and grade breakdown may initially be approximate, but are normally confirmed no later than the last day of registration for the term. If faculty deviate from section 2.3 on the grading system, the grading system that will be used must be clearly indicated. **If additional requirements beyond the final grade that must be satisfied in order for the student to pass the course, this should be clearly identified in the course outline.**
5. Due dates for major course elements should be indicated. The dates may be tentative initially, but are normally confirmed no later than the last day of registration for the term. If changes to due dates are required students should be given at least two weeks notice. Final scheduled exam dates are excluded from the information provided, and will be presented at a later date in the term.
6. TA information, as available.
7. Any required time commitments occurring outside of the formally scheduled lectures, tutorials, labs and discussion groups. Changes may be required but students should be given at least two weeks notice. These time commitments are specific to course requirements and do not imply study time or group work, for example.
8. The outline must also include/reference all University policies governing academic accommodation.

2.2.1 Early Feedback Guideline

Providing feedback to students on academic work, completed or in progress, is an integral part of teaching and learning in that it allows students to measure their understanding of material, the success of their learning strategies, and their progress on learning objectives. While the nature and frequency of such feedback will vary with the course and level, Carleton University is committed to providing students with appropriate and timely feedback on their work. Accordingly, wherever possible, and especially in first- and second-year courses, instructors are urged to include academic work that is assigned, evaluated and returned prior to the 25th teaching day of each term. More generally, all instructors are urged to include academic work that is assigned, evaluated and returned prior to the 40th teaching day of each term.

The spirit of this guideline should be followed during the summer term. In particular, all instructors are urged to include academic work that is assigned, evaluated, and returned at least two days prior to the last day to withdraw from the course in Early, Late, or Full Summer term.

Course outlines should provide an indication of approximately when the first graded piece of work will be returned to students. In cases where a course does not lend itself to early feedback, this should be clearly noted on the course outline.

New Resources	No New Resources
Summary	Clarification of requirements for course outline
Rationale for change	To help faculty and students further understand requirements for course evaluation
Transition/Implementation	

Program reviewer
comments

Senate Executive Committee
September 18, 2018
11:00 a.m. in 503S Tory Building

MINUTES

Present: B. Appel Kuzmarov, B. A. Bacon (Chair), A. Chandler, L. Dyke, B. Hughes, J. Tomberlin

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:02 am.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The Committee approved the Senate Executive Committee agenda for September 18, 2018.

2. Approval of the Minutes:

a. Senate Executive Minutes: May 22, 2018

The Committee approved, with minor corrections, the minutes of the meeting of the Senate Executive Committee on May 22, 2018.

b. Senate Executive Minutes: June 12

The Committee approved the minutes of the emergency meeting of Senate Executive on June 12, 2018.

c. Senate Executive Minutes of E-Polls:

The Committee approved the minutes of the e-polls conducted in July and August, 2018.

3. Approval of Senate agenda: September 28, 2018

It was noted that the ratification of CUCQA membership should be added to the agenda under Item 6: Administration.

The committee approved, by consensus, the Senate agenda for September 28, 2018, with the above addition.

4. Action Under the Empowering Motion

This item was not discussed.

5. Items for discussion: Process Towards Free Speech Policy

The committee discussed the Free Speech Policy directive, recently distributed by the Ontario Ministry, which mandates that all colleges and universities in Ontario publish a Free Speech Policy by January 1st, 2019. Committee members agreed that this is an academic matter that should be addressed by Senate.

Given the tight timelines for completing the policy, committee members agreed that, pending Senate approval, a small task force of Senators should be formed as soon as possible after the September 28 meeting. The Task Force, led by the Clerk of Senate and comprised of elected faculty members and students, would draft a policy and bring it to Senate for full input on October 19th. After Senate discussion on October 19, opportunities for broader input and consultation would be provided through an online portal via the Carleton University website.

Following this consultative period, the Task Force would edit and revise the policy and bring to Senate for approval at the November 30th meeting. If necessary, further edits could be made to the policy at this point and Senate could meet on December 14 for the final approval of the policy.

This draft procedure with schedule details will be presented for discussion and approval at the September 28 Senate meeting. The committee agreed on the following composition of the Task Force: 3 Senators who are elected faculty members, 1 Senator who is an undergraduate student, 1 Senator who is a graduate student, and the Clerk of Senate.

6. Other Business:

There was none.

7. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 11:52 am.