



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 April 25, 2025 at 2:00 pm
PK608**

MINUTES – OPEN SESSION

Present: J. Armstrong, M. Bahran, M. Barbeau, S. Blanchard, A. Bowker, J. Brunet, S. Burges, A. Buri, A. Butler, J. Chan, J. P. Corriveau, C. Cruickshank (acting for L. Kostiuk), E. Cyr, M. DeRosa, R. Gorelick, R. Goubran, K. Graham, L. Grant, J. Greenberg, T. Haats, N. Hagigi, M. Haines, S. Hawkins, X. Haziza, D. Hornsby, D. Howe, G. Lacroix, N. Laporte, J. Lynch, G. Maracle, J. Mason, A. Masoumi, D. Mendeloff, S. Monastero, H. Nemiroff, B. O'Neill, A. Paiva, P. Rankin, R. Renfroe, M. Rivers-Moore, M. Rooney, S. Sadaf, A. Shotwell, E. Sloan (Clerk), C. Smelser, R. Teather, W. Tettey (Chair), R. Tfaily, C. Trudel, C. Viau, S. Viel, G. Wainer, J. Wallace

Regrets: A. Bordeleau, F. Brouard, J. Debanne, E. Gray, K. Hellemans, P. Kouzovnikov, A. MacDonald, B. MacLeod, L. Madokoro, L. Marshall, D. Maseko, D. McNair, M. Nadeem, M. Papineau, M. Pearson, O. Saloojee, P. Williams

Absent: M. Abarghouei, T. Davidson, S. El Fitori, B. Heerspink, J. Kundu, Y. Ono, R. Treasure

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

1. Welcome & Approval of Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm. The Chair began the meeting by acknowledging the passing of Professor Emeritus Warren Thorngate, from the Department of Psychology. The Chair expressed condolences to all who knew and loved him.

The Chair then noted that this would be the last meeting for departing student ex officio members Allan Buri (CASG President), Sarah El Fitori (CUSA President), Jayesh Kundu (GSA

President) and Mahsa Abarghouei (GSA VP Academic). The Chair thanked all for their service on Senate.

Following a review of procedures, a Senator rose to speak against the recent decision to return to in-person meetings without a hybrid option. The Senator felt that this decision limits full engagement and participation of Senators, particularly for elected members. They noted that ex officio members who are absent and cannot attend themselves have the option to send those temporarily acting in their role to Senate, whereas elected members are not permitted to send proxies if they cannot attend. The Senator asked for a reconsideration of this rule, particularly now that elected members do not have the option to join remotely.

The Chair thanked the Senator for their perspective.

It was **MOVED** (M. Haines, A. Paiva) that Senate approve the agenda for the meeting of Senate on April 25, 2025, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

2. Minutes: March 28, 2025 – open session

It was **MOVED** (S. Viel, J. Lynch) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting of March 28, 2025, as presented.

A small typo was noted on page 13 of the minutes.

With this correction made, the motion **PASSED**.

3. Matters Arising:

A Senator asked a question about the use of artificial intelligence to generate images and text from social media accounts on campus, rather than utilizing resources on campus that could provide these services. They asked if the university has an official stance or policy on this issue. The Chair thanked the Senator for the question, but noted that questions regarding individuals' use of social media accounts is not within Senate's purview, and should be raised in other venues.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began his remarks noting the recent appointment of Howard Nemiroff as Dean of Sprott School of Business, beginning July 1, 2025. Professor Nemiroff had been serving as Interim Dean in this position for the past 2 years. The Chair congratulated Professor Nemiroff and wished him continuing success in the role.

The 2024-25 Future Learning Innovation Fellowship recipients were recently announced. This program supports instructors in implementing innovative teaching practices. The Chair extended congratulations to Kevin Cheung (Mathematics & Statistics), Rick Colbourne (Sprott School of Business), Vicky McArthur (School of Journalism & Communication), Brenda Morris (School of Social Work) and Brian Strong (School of Linguistics & Language Studies).

The Chair next reported that April marks the end of the Campus Community Campaign. Since the last campaign, 490 gifts were made through Carleton FutureFunder, with 175 of these providing ongoing support via monthly donations. The Chair extended his thanks to all within the Carleton community supporting these efforts.

The Chair highlighted recent achievements of Carleton Engineering students. Three Carleton students excelled in the Ontario Engineering Competition, taking first place in Senior Design, first place in Consulting, and second place in re-engineering. Carleton also performed well in several national and international competitions including:

- The Troitsky Bridge Design Team where they won first place in 6 categories
- CU-InSpace, in which Carleton's Rocketry Team designed, built, launched, and recovered a rocket at the Spaceport America Competition. This team ranked among the top 30 in the 30,000-ft category out of over 120 teams.
- Carleton Planetary Robotics: The Carleton Rover was accepted into the International University Rover Challenge in Moab, Utah. Only 38 teams worldwide were invited to the finals, and Carleton was one of just 5 Canadian teams to have that honour.

The Chair congratulated the Engineering students and their faculty member supporters for these achievements.

Finally, the Chair reminded Senators planning to attend June Convocation to register before the deadline of May 23, 2025.

5. Question Period

There were no questions submitted in advance by Senators.

6. Administration (Clerk)

The Clerk reported on the election results for the Senate faculty-member representative on the Board of Governors, noting that Kevin Graham had won the election.

The Clerk reminded Senators who have not responded to the 2025 Senate Survey to do so before the closing date of May 1, 2025. Those Senators serving on Senate Standing Committees were advised that the Committee survey will open after May 1; members will receive an invitation via email to respond to the survey.

7. Reports:

a) Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admissions and Studies Policy (SCCASP)

Committee Chair Julia Wallace presented 8 items for Senate approval and two items for information.

Items for approval. These were combined into an omnibus motion.

It was **MOVED** (J. Wallace, D. Hornsby) that Senate approves the regulations as presented.

The motion **PASSED**

Motions within the Omnibus:

- *Addition of B. Acc. Course & Graduation requirements*
MOTION: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1598: R-UG-Business effective for the 2025-26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.
- *Re-admission not permitted after graduation*
MOTION: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1867: R-UG-3.1.13 Simultaneous and Subsequent Degrees effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.
- *Addition of new programs to ACE regulation*
MOTION: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1869: \$-UG-3.2.1 Academic Continuation Evaluation effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.
- *Removal of BAS (Non-Honours) and addition of new B ACC to the regulation re minimum CGPA requirements.*

MOTION: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1882: R-UG-3.4.6 Minimum CGPA Requirements for Graduation effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

- *Overall required CGPA lowered for COOP BGINS program*

MOTION: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-2028: R-UG-COOP-B.G.In.S. Admission and Continuation Requirements effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

- *Removing BAS (non-honours) elements (cleanup)*

MOTION: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1608: R-UG-B.Arch. Residency Requirement effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

- *Clarification of 9-term rule*

MOTION: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1853: \$-UG-3.1.3 Absence from the University effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

- *Deletion of BAS (non honours)*

MOTION: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1949: R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Architectural Studies effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Items for Information

- Graduate minor modifications for April 2025
- Undergraduate minor modifications for April 2025

There was no discussion of the items for information.

b) Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC)

Committee Chair David Hornsby presented 3 major modifications for Senate approval. To expedite business, these were combined into an omnibus motion.

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, C. Viau) that Senate approve the major modifications as presented below.

The motion **PASSED**.

Motions included in the Omnibus:

- MOTION: That Senate approve the name change and major modification to the BSc Hons program in Biotechnology and the introduction of BTEC 4908, 4909 and 4910 as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

- MOTION: That Senate approve the major modification to the undergraduate program in Chemistry and Earth Sciences as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- MOTION: That Senate approve the introduction of an accelerated pathway to the MSC in Earth Sciences as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

c) Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC) (E. Sloan)

The Clerk presented a motion to ratify 19 new committee members to 9 Senate Standing Committees:

It was **MOVED** (E. Sloan, K. Graham) that Senate ratify the nominees for the Senate committees as presented, for service beginning July 1, 2025.

The motion **PASSED**.

The Clerk next presented a revised Sprott Faculty Board Constitution for Senate approval. She reminded Senators that Senate passed a motion requiring Faculty Boards to revise their constitutions to support the transfer of authority for graduate curriculum approvals from the former FGPA to the Faculties, and that these revised constitutions were to be brought to SAGC for review before being approved by Senate.

To assist in the review process, the University Secretariat drafted a constitution template based on requirements outlined in the AGU; this template was used by SAGC in its review of the Faculty Board Constitutions.

The Sprott Faculty Board Constitution was revised in accordance with this template and has been approved by the Sprott Faculty Board. In bringing the Constitution to Senate for approval, SAGC members noted that the membership of the Sprott Faculty Board includes an administrative staff member with full voting rights, which is unusual. SAGC has suggested that this anomaly be reconsidered by the Sprott Faculty Board when it next reviews its constitution, with a suggested date of April 2030. The Clerk added that SAGC was not unanimous in recommending the Constitution to Senate for approval.

It was **MOVED** (E. Sloan, H. Nemiroff) that Senate approve the Faculty Board Constitution of the Sprott School of Business, as presented.

Discussion:

A Senator noted that the Sprott Faculty Board Constitution has reduced the number of elected Carleton Academic Student Government (CASG) representatives that should be

on the Sprott Faculty Board from 4 to 1. They added that CASG recommends that this be changed to allow all 4 elected CASG Sprott representatives to be on the Faculty Board, in alignment with the recommendations in the AGU for student membership.

A Senator who also serves on SAGC rose to provide more context for the concerns expressed in the memo. The main objection relates to the designation of a member of professional services staff as a voting member of the Faculty Board. Faculty Boards are academic governance bodies, and are creatures of Senate; as such, it is felt that it is not appropriate for a staff member to be voting on academic matters or electing Senators. The AGU does give the Faculty Board the authority to supplement its membership, but the Senator maintained that professional staff should not be voting members of the Faculty Board. The Senator asked the Dean of Sprott to explain why this person must have a voting role on the Faculty Board.

The Dean of Sprott responded that the AGU (Article 11.3) specifies minimum requirements for membership and also states that Faculty Boards may augment their membership as they see fit. In addition, Sprott is unique among the Faculties at Carleton in that it does not have departments. For other Faculties, departmental boards can and often do include non-academic staff members with voting privileges. For Sprott, non-academic staff have no other meaningful way to participate in decisions around feasibility as it pertains to program logistics, staffing, etc. The manager of operations at Sprott represents all of Sprott staff on the Faculty Board, and is familiar with what the School can handle with regards to program delivery and the student experience. Sprott has not been a department within the Faculty of Public Affairs and Management (PAM) for over two decades, yet the Manager of Operations has continually participated in and voted at Faculty Board meetings for all of those years. The Dean, therefore, did not agree with the concerns expressed by members of SAGC and reflected in the memo, but in the spirit of collegiality, has agreed that Sprott will revisit the issue when it next reviews its Faculty Board Constitution.

Some other Senators broadened the discussion to the relationship between Senate and Faculty Boards, and how much autonomy Faculty Boards actually have within the academic structure. Another Senator reported that at FASS Faculty Board, it was felt that the changes proposed by SAGC in its review of the FASS Faculty Board Constitution would weaken the autonomy of the FASS Faculty Board, and as a result FASS has struck its own ad hoc committee to review its Faculty Board Constitution independently. The Senator noted that it was felt that SAGC was dictating to FASS what should be included in their Faculty Board Constitution.

The Clerk responded that SAGC is not dictating to Faculty Boards, but has provided a template and suggested changes to align with the template, in order to be helpful, and to assist Faculty Boards in their revisions.

Discussion closed at this point and the Chair called the question.

The motion **PASSED**.

d) Senate Executive Committee (P. Rankin)

It was **MOVED** (P. Rankin, R. Renfro) that Senate approve the appointment of Kim Hellemans as COU Academic Colleague, to serve a 3-year term of service beginning July 1, 2025.

Discussion:

Provost Pauline Rankin spoke to this item, noting that Senator Kim Hellemans has indicated her willingness to continue to serve as Academic Colleague for another 3-year term. In accordance with established procedures, Senate Executive is bringing forward her nomination for Senate approval.

A Senator asked if nominations from the floor could be allowed for this position, since the AIP Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, which is the guide for Carleton's Senate, states that nominations from the floor should always be permitted. The Chair responded that the process does not allow for nominations from the floor. The Academic Colleague is an appointment that is brought forward by the President to the Senate Executive Committee. The Senate Executive Committee then considers it and determines whether or not they will bring the name to Senate. Another Senator also noted that "nomination" does not apply to this role, since the Academic Colleague is appointed, upon recommendation to Senate, and appointment procedures differ from nomination procedures.

The motion **PASSED**. Senator Root Gorelick asked that his abstention from the vote be recorded in the minutes, for reasons noted above in the discussion.

8. Financial Update (Provost)

The Provost provided a financial update to Senators. She noted that the full budget presentation will be brought to Senate on June 6, following the approval of the budget by the Board of Governors. In addition, an Operating Budget Webinar will be held in May for those who would like more information prior to June 6.

The projected structural deficit for 2025-26 will be almost the same as the structural deficit for 2024-25, despite significant efforts made to reduce spending over the past year. The projected base operating deficit is approximately \$32M for 2025-26. The base operating budget deficit was \$31.6M for 2024-25.

The university undertook a spending reduction campaign for the 2025-26 fiscal year, which included a Voluntary Retirement Incentive Program, adjusted class sizes and offerings, and reduced general and administrative spending. These spending reductions are offset by a continued projection of international student enrolment declines, ongoing salary increases and rising campus infrastructure costs.

Carleton continues to implement its Mission Sustainability Framework, which targets areas for cost containment and revenue growth to protect the integrity and sustainability of the academic mission. The university is also participating in the Ministry of Colleges Universities and Research Excellence and Security (MCURES) Efficiency and Accountability Fund (EAF) Review, which will be used to help inform action toward mission sustainability. Over the next several months, the review will involve a third-party consulting firm working to identify efficiencies and best practices in areas such as governance, administrative and student services, academic programming, facilities, procurement and revenue generation opportunities. Carleton's participation in the review will be fully funded by MCURES through the allocation of up to \$500,000 to cover direct costs billed by a third-party consulting firm.

Discussion:

A Senator asked if there could be any positive aspects to the MCURES process. The Provost responded that the process is expected to yield insights into Carleton's operations and that the consulting firm will be confirmed by June 1st, following a rigorous procurement process.

A Senator referenced the expenditure resulting from the repeal of Bill 124, and asked why Contract Instructors did not receive any retroactive pay from that process. The Provost responded that since this relates to the CUPE 4600 collective agreement bargaining process, which has concluded, they cannot comment further on it.

A Senator asked if it would be legal for Carleton to raise its tuition fees by 30% without government approval, and simply forgo the government grant so that Carleton would be independent of government control. Could this be considered as an option, particularly if a coalition of Ontario universities took this approach? The President responded that the ramifications of such an action are far-reaching and very serious, and no other university, even those in far worse shape than Carleton, has chosen this route.

A Senator asked for more information and clarity on the issues with Microsoft, which has recently increased its fees so dramatically that Carleton users have been asked to reduce data storage space. Another Senator added that the message from ITS has been a call for a 98% reduction in cloud storage. Faculty members with research data in the cloud are very concerned with these developments. The Provost replied that a Digital Strategy Committee is examining these issues and is aware of the gravity of the situation. She also suggested that a presentation to Senate on this issue at a future meeting could be useful.

In response to another question, the Provost confirmed that other institutions are in worse shape than Carleton. Carleton has been relying on its reserves, which is a non-renewable resource, but now must implement cost-recovery methods, and must work productively to arrive at solutions. The Chair added that the Efficiency and Accountability Review is an opportunity for self-reflection, and that the best approach is for all of us to work collaboratively with open minds, and not to impede the process.

The Chair thanked the Provost for this valuable update and also Senators for their questions and engaged discussion.

9. Discussion of Framework for Suspending Admissions (D. Hornsby)

The Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President Academic, David Hornsby, spoke to this item. A draft framework was circulated in advance to Senators, outlining both the process for suspending admissions, and the process for reinstating or closing a suspended program.

The need for the framework has become apparent over the past admissions cycle as a number of academic units have been seeking to suspend admissions to their low-enrolment programs, and these requests have grown significantly. The moment requires a broader set of stakeholders to be involved in these decisions, and a defined process to ensure academic and administrative considerations are taken into account while also acknowledging the need to move quickly.

The framework is an effort to balance academic and administrative actions and considerations. It has taken into consideration feedback and input from VPARC, SQAPC, SCCASP and also from Senators in previous meetings. The framework conveys that suspension of academic program enrolment is not meant to be a permanent act, as it is only permitted for two admission cycles. Additionally, it acknowledges the need for a broader set of evidence points beyond low enrolment, and clarifies that the pathway out of suspension follows established institutional quality assurance practices, namely:

- Program reinstatement (A1 major modification)
- Program redesign (A1 major modification)
- Program closure (track B major modification)

All of these steps would require the engagement of Senate committees and the approval of Senate.

Discussion:

In response to a question from Senate, Vice-Provost Hornsby confirmed that the framework is being held outside of any Senate committee, and was developed through his office.

Senators asked for clarity on the definition of “low enrolment” and other threshold criteria that would be used as rationale for suspension, so that there would be consistency across Faculties. The Vice-Provost responded that a single definition of low enrolment for all programs is not possible as the costs are not uniform across the institution. Instead, the individual academic unit should drive the action, as they are in the best position to determine what low enrolment is for their unit. He added that the framework also captures other reasons for suspending admissions, including program refresh. Some Senators still insisted that this section of the framework could be more well defined.

Several Senators spoke out in favour of Senate having more of a role in approving and/or overseeing admission suspensions, as this is an academic matter within the purview of Senate. The Vice-Provost stressed that there are broader considerations than those in Senate's purview, and that administrative and operational factors also need to be considered. Additionally, there is no provision for academic suspension in the IQAP, since the action does not result in any structural or program changes, but only affects the admissions process. He noted that admission suspensions need to be enacted quickly, often within a matter of days, which would make going through Senate for a vote impractical.

Senators continued to express their concern with this approach, and pressed for a venue for Senate involvement and oversight.

The Chair recognized Nadeem Siddiqi, Vice-Provost, Graduate Studies, who requested permission to speak to this issue. Vice-Provost Siddiqi noted that suspension of admission for programs or pathways is a routine occurrence in graduate studies. Graduate programs are not cyclical, so closing the ability to apply to a program in a timely manner is critical. They would not be in favour of any action that would hinder or slow down this process for graduate programs.

It was noted that Senate does vote on either reinstating a program or closing it, once the period of suspension has expired. In this case, Senate is the authority, even if their decision does not align with VPARC recommendations. The Chair reminded Senators that the decision on whether to suspend/close/reinstate a program begins with the individual unit, and robust discussions around that action should take place at Departmental and Faculty Board meetings, before the item is brought to Senate either for a vote or for information.

The Chair thanked Vice-Provost Hornsby for the presentation and Senators for the rich discussion.

10. Reports for Information

a) Senate Executive Minutes (March 18, 2025)

There was no discussion of this item.

11. Other Business

There was no other business.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned (D. Howe, C. Viau) at 4:02 p.m.