



*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 February 28, 2025 at 2:00 pm  
PK608**

**MINUTES – OPEN SESSION**

**Present:** J. Armstrong, M. Bahran, M. Barbeau, S. Blanchard, A. Bordeleau, A. Bowker, F. Brouard, S. Burges, A. Buri, J. Chan, J. P. Corriveau, E. Cyr, J. Debanne, M. DeRosa, R. Goubran, K. Graham, L. Grant, E. Gray, J. Greenberg, T. Haats, N. Hagigi, M. Haines, S. Hawkins, X. Haziza, , K. Hellemans, D. Hornsby, D. Howe, L. Kostiuk, P. Kouzovnikov, G. Lacroix, A. Lannon, N. Laporte, J. Lynch, A. MacDonald, B. MacLeod, L. Madokoro, G. Maracle, J. Mason, D. McNair, D. Mendeloff, M. Nadeem, B. O’Neill, A. Paiva, P. Rankin, R. Renfroe, M. Rivers-Moore, M. Rooney, S. Sadaf, A. Shotwell, E. Sloan (Clerk), W. Tettey (Chair), R. Tfaily, R. Treasure, C. Trudel, C. Viau, S. Viel, G. Wainer, J. Wallace, P. Williams

**Regrets:** R. Gorelick, L. Marshall, D. Maseko, A. Masoumi, S. Monastero, H. Nemiroff, Y. Ono, M. Papineau, M. Pearson, O. Saloojee, C. Smelser, D. Sprague, R. Teather

**Absent:** M. Abarghouei, T. Davidson, S. El Fitori, B. Heerspink, J. Kundu

**Recording Secretary:** K. McKinley

---

**1. Welcome & Approval of Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm. The Chair noted that the meeting would begin with a Closed Session to approve the Winter graduation lists.

It was **MOVED** (A. Paiva, A. Shotwell) that Senate move into the Closed Session of the meeting.

The motion **PASSED**.

*(Minutes for the Closed Session of the meeting are in a separate document.)*

---

*Minutes after Open Session resumed:*

Approval of open agenda:

The Chair noted that item 6(a) Administration – Senate Schedule 2025-26 has been pulled from the agenda and will be presented at the next Senate meeting.

It was **MOVED** (C. Viau, A. Paiva) that Senate approve the open agenda for the meeting of Senate on February 28, 2025, as amended.

The motion **PASSED**.

**2. Minutes:** January 31, 2025

It was **MOVED** (E. Gray, A. Paiva) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting of January 31, 2025 as presented.

A Senator noticed a typo on page 18 regarding the date of the February 2025 Senate meeting.

With this amendment to the minutes, the motion **PASSED**.

**3. Matters Arising:**

There were none.

**4. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair began his remarks noting the recent passing of Dr. Roland Leigh Jeffreys, faculty member at Carleton from 1967-2005, and former Chair of the Classics Department. The Chair expressed condolences to all that knew and loved him.

The Chair reminded Senators of the in-person protocols, and noted that due to technical issues the hybrid meeting option for Senate would be suspended for this meeting.

The Chair next extended congratulations to the 20+ recipients of this year's Achievement Awards. These awards honour the research and teaching excellence of Carleton's academic staff and recognize impactful and dedicated efforts in advancing knowledge.

The Chair also noted that Virtual Ventures, run by the Faculty of Engineering and Design, has won the 2024 Actua Award for Excellence in outstanding STEM outreach. The program has grown to over 22,000 youth participants, which is double the number from 2 years ago. The Chair congratulated those responsible for this high-impact program.

February marked the global celebration of Black History Month. The Chair made note of several events on campus including his conversation with Professor Adrian Harewood on Black advancement within the Canadian academic context, and the February 11<sup>th</sup> Black on the Ballot panel and discussion. The Chair thanked all who took the time to support these events.

On February 20<sup>th</sup>, over 200 faculty and staff members were recognized for their dedicated service at the annual Service Excellence Awards. The Chair extended congratulations to all nominees and winners.

The Chair also reminded Senators that March 8 is International Women's Day. The Carleton community will be highlighting the social, economic, cultural and political achievements of women across the university through a number of special events and communications. Senators were encouraged to take part and to support these events.

Finally, the Chair noted that February 28, 2025 marks the beginning of the month of Ramadan. He extended warmest wishes to all Muslim students, faculty and staff for this time of reflection, prayer and community.

## **5. Question Period**

Questions were submitted in advance by 5 Senators:

### Questions submitted by Senator Sean Burges:

In a time where academic units are being asked to innovate, collaborate, and make hard decisions, academic staff need clarity about how 'bums on seats' in classrooms translates into funding and resources flowing to departments/programs and to the University itself.

- 1) How does the university calculate the funding that flows to a department/program on a per student enrolled in said department/program basis?

- 2) How does the university calculate the funding that flows to a department/program for each student enrolled in a class delivered by that department/program?
- 3) How does the funding flowing to an academic department/program translate into resources available for planning and delivering education and student enrichment?
- 4) How does enrolment at the University translate into funding flows from the Province?
- 5) How much of the University's funding (nominal and percentage) from the Province comes in the form a 'block grant' and a 'student enrolment contingent grant'?
- 6) Can you please explain how enrolment-based funding from the Province to the University is calculated and under what envelopes it falls.
- 7) Is there a limit to how much operating funding the University can get from the Province by increasing enrolments?

*With the consent of Senator Burges, these questions were answered by the Provost in Item 8 – University Funding: A Primer.*

---

Question Submitted by Allan Buri:

At its March 1st, 2024 meeting, Senate repealed the Academic Accommodations During Labour Disputes Policy. According to the minutes from its April 14th, 2023 meeting, this Policy was the mechanism that required a meeting of the Academic Continuity Committee (ACC) to specifically discuss academic accommodations after eleven days of the CUPE 4600 strike. CASG was also consulted during those discussions. Without this Policy, what procedural mechanisms are required to trigger a meeting of the ACC to discuss academic accommodations, and is the Senate Executive Committee still committed to engaging with CASG to discuss academic accommodations during potential labour disputes, including SAT/UNSAT?

*Response by Provost Pauline Rankin: The Academic Continuity Committee (ACC) is chaired by the Provost and can meet any time it is needed; accommodations and any other relevant issues can be discussed by the committee when it meets. The Provost reminded Senators that the ACC met during Covid and consulted with CASG on academic accommodations at that time as well. This approach will continue as merited.*

---

Questions submitted by Jody Mason:

Now that faculties have numbers for the early retirement offer and for CI cuts for 2025-26:

- what is the plan to ensure that units will be able to offer academic programs in 2025-26 (and going forward) of the same quality they have been offering in the past? (“quality” is affected by many factors, including instructor-student ratios, access to equipment, breadth of course offerings, etc.)
- what does the university expect to save as a result of these combined measures (early retirement offer + CI cuts) / does the university have examples from other universities of how such measures have actually helped save money?

*Response by Provost Pauline Rankin: The Voluntary Retirement Incentive Program was offered to faculty and staff who were already eligible for retirement; therefore, it is not an early retirement incentive. The average age of those contacted was 69.*

*29% of those contacted, or 154 employees, took up the offer for Voluntary Retirement, which is a higher response rate than initially anticipated. Of these, 27% are faculty members spread across the 5 Faculties, and 73% are professional staff. All who applied for the VRIP were approved.*

*In order to ensure quality of programs, the Deans of all Faculties will be prioritizing core courses, leveraging technology, reviewing resource allocations and increasing the T.A. support where appropriate. The Provost noted that it is too soon to report on the financial impact of the VRIP program, and on how many positions will need to be refilled. More details will be forthcoming when the operating budget report is presented to Senate in April.*

*Some Senators spoke of anticipated stresses within academic departments due to the loss of long-serving administrative staff with valuable institutional knowledge. The Provost responded that the Deans will submit staffing requests after assessing their needs.*

*A Senator noted that there is a perception that Carleton is continuing to hire and create more administrative positions in a time of crisis when faculty positions are under threat. They asked the Provost to comment on this. The Provost responded that administrators are important members of the Carleton team and do much to support faculty members in fulfilling the university’s academic mission; it is not helpful to pit academic staff against administrative staff in this situation or to assume that one group is more important than the other, as we are all part of the same team working towards the same goals.*

*In response to another question, Vice-Provost Hornsby clarified that suspension of enrolment in a program does not require Senate approval, but Senate will be informed when this happens. Suspension, which is not the same as closure, is only permitted for 2 academic*

*cycles. Senate approval is then required for a program to come out of suspension.*

---

#### Questions submitted by Gabriel Wainer

##### Question 1:

On January's senate, the following question was asked: "Students facing Academic Offenses have the right to appeal decisions made by the Dean's office to the Senate Appeals Committee. However, in some situations, the opposite would need to be considered. There are cases related to Academic Integrity or Academic Offenses dismissed without proper investigation due to delays in the process or the backlog of cases. Additionally, there are instances where the Dean's office dismisses an offense despite the instructor's strong certainty regarding the violation and adherence to standard reporting procedures, sometimes without providing a clear explanation on the decisions."

In a previous Senate meeting, it was requested to handle Academic Offenses "in a timely manner". Nevertheless, "timely manner" has been defined as "two terms after the offence". According to past practices, a "timely manner" was 2 weeks to 1 month. How can guarantee that instructors do not have to wait two terms (or a year) to solve cases of plagiarism, and that handling of the cases is independent of the authorities in charge of the case?

*Response by Faculty of Engineering & Design Dean Larry Kostiuk: Faculties may have different timelines for resolving academic integrity cases, but all Faculties are aligned with regards to academic integrity guidelines and processes as outlined in the policy.*

*Prior to 2021, the Academic Integrity Policy contained very strict timelines for faculty members to submit documents and for Associate Deans to send out letters. Due to the tsunami of academic integrity issues during the Covid pandemic, these timelines were removed from the policy. "In a timely manner" is therefore not clearly defined.*

*Some flexibility is built into the timelines around the initial response, considering the complexity of the issue and the Instructor's marking load. At the Associate Dean level, if the case is isolated and straight-forward, a decision on whether to pursue the case can be made within a few days of receiving the allegation, and the entire file generally can be resolved within a month. Less-straight-forward cases where there are a number of allegations in peak time (midterm, end of term) can cause a backlog and a divergence from the expected timelines. The goal is to resolve the case within the term in which it occurs, but if the final exam is involved the case will extend into the next term.*

*The Dean noted that there have been some extreme situations in FED, for example 40+ student cases submitted within a single allegation; these obviously would take much longer to resolve.*

*In a follow-up question, a Senator asked how delaying resolution of academic integrity cases can be considered equitable, as it holds students back from progressing within their program.*

*The Dean acknowledged the concern with timelines and added that in the Faculty of Engineering and Design, additional academics were brought on as Assistant Deans (Academic Integrity) to work alongside the Associate Deans to address the large number of cases.*

## Question 2

The Faculty of Engineering has to provide a Constitution to Senate. It has been told that the guidelines are under preparation. Although this is a major commitment: is there a timeline as for when is the Constitution going to be submitted for discussion and approval? As there is no Constitution available in Engineering, is there any kind of superset of University rules that the Faculty of Engineering should be following while there is no Constitution in place?

- a. Yes: which ones and where are they available?
- b. No: should Engineering adhere to past practices? (defined as “Before COVID practices). Or is there any other set of rules that should be used in the meantime?

*Response from Clerk of Senate and SAGC Chair Elinor Sloan: The Engineering Faculty Board Constitution is currently being drafted by Professor Don Russell. The Senate Academic Governance Committee will receive a draft in March or April and expects to bring it to Senate for approval by June of this year. In the meantime, the Academic Governance of the University (AGU) provides governance guidelines for Senate and Faculty Boards.*

## Question 3:

The section:

<https://calendar.carleton.ca/undergrad/regulations/academicregulationsoftheuniversity/grading/#course-outline> specifies Carleton’s course outline.

The rules are clear, and covers the generic aspects of outlines. Nevertheless, there has been some language at Senate and Faculties not written formally anywhere. In particular, it has been said numerous times that the course outline is a “contract”, but there is no such

language. But in some cases it's being used as a "contract". Similarly, there are "implicit" rules about what should be in a course outline, and such rules change according to which reads the rules, the professor asking the question, or the person that makes the decision. The decisions are made based on "regulations", but such regulations do not exist in writing. If a Professor decides to use a strategy for their class, and they are denied to use such strategy based on a non-existing regulation is brought, this would be affecting the Professor's Academic Freedom.

Question: Do professors only have to adhere to the rules in the link above, exactly as written, or there is any further written documentation explaining in detail what can be included in a Course Outline, what cannot be included, the things that a Professor can do to teach their class, and the way in which students are evaluated, following Academic Freedom in their classroom?

*Response from Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President Academic David Hornsby: Regulations around course outlines and teaching practices are dispersed among a number of different places, not just the calendar as indicated in the question. Vice-Provost Hornsby agreed that a central resource on course outlines for faculty members would be helpful, and should be developed as soon as possible.*

---

Question submitted by Nir Hagigi:

Given that academic freedom is a core principle of scholarly inquiry, and considering that many institutions have already established mechanisms to monitor and address academic freedom concerns, what steps would be required to explore the creation of a similar procedure at Carleton? Is there a process or timeline for reviewing this issue, and if not, how can one be established? Furthermore, which body within the university would be responsible for overseeing and implementing such a mechanism?

**Rationale**

Academic freedom is a fundamental principle that protects faculty, researchers, and students in their ability to engage in intellectual inquiry, express different perspectives, and pursue scholarship without undue interference. However, Carleton University currently lacks a sufficient and structured mechanism for addressing academic freedom violations. Furthermore, unlike many of our peer institutions (such as the [University of Ottawa](#), [McGill University](#), [Wilfrid Laurier University](#), etc.), Carleton lacks a dedicated policy safeguarding academic freedom, leaving a critical gap.



- For students, there is no formalized body to hear concerns when academic freedom is restricted. The only current reporting mechanism is Equity and Inclusive Communities (EIC), which primarily addresses discrimination and hate crimes, not violations of academic freedom. If a student is censored, penalized, or restricted in their academic work or extracurriculars due to political speech, controversial research topics, or institutional pressures, there is no clear appeals process.

In recent years, concerns about self-censorship, institutional overreach, and the suppression of critical scholarship, particularly in politically sensitive fields, have grown within universities across Canada. Without a dedicated mechanism to examine these issues, our institution risks failing to adequately uphold its commitment to academic freedom for its community.

Establishing a structured mechanism to address academic freedom violations at Carleton University would benefit the entire academic community by creating a more accountable and intellectually open environment:

- Faculty would gain stronger institutional support in defending their ability to pursue critical scholarship without fear of administrative interference or external pressure.
- For students, it would provide a clear avenue to raise concerns when their academic expression is restricted, ensuring that intellectual exploration and debate remain protected within the classroom and beyond.
- The administration would benefit from a standardized process to handle academic freedom concerns proactively rather than reactively, reducing the likelihood of reputational harm and extended legal battles.

*Response from Provost Pauline Rankin: As defined in the CUASA Collective Agreement, academic freedom is in place to offer those involved in research and teaching*

- *Freedom in carrying out research and in publishing results thereof*
- *Freedom in carrying out teaching and discussing their subject*
- *Freedom from institutional censorship*

*Academic Freedom is enshrined in Article 4 of the CUASA Collective Agreement, in Article 10 of the Collective Agreement for Postdoctoral Fellows and in Article 10 of the CUPE 4600 – #2 Collective Agreement for Contract Instructors.*

*The procedure for resolution of any claim for members of these unions is dealt with through established grievance processes. The suggestion for creating a new mechanism*

*would need to be negotiated as part of a collective bargaining process rather than via a Senate motion.*

*Freedom of expression and freedom of speech for students is protected through Carleton's Freedom of Speech policy. Section 5 of the Student Rights and Responsibility Policy also outlines students' rights to freedom of discussion and assembly and the right to a fair process. The Department of Equity and Inclusive Communities is not the appropriate venue to address claims of violation of freedom of speech unless these raise a question of discrimination and/or harassment under one of the protected grounds within the Ontario Human Rights Code. The Provost suggested that the process for students be clarified within the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy, rather than by creating yet another committee or policy. Coincidentally, the Rights & Responsibilities Policy is up for review and this issue can be raised as part of this review during the consultation phase.*

The Chair thanked Senators for the questions and the responses.

## **6. Administration (Clerk)**

### **a) Senate Schedule**

This item was pulled from the binder and deleted from the agenda.

## **7. Reports:**

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

Committee Chair Julia Wallace presented 3 items for Senate approval and 3 items for information.

#### Items for approval:

##### Advanced Standing for CEGEP Students

It was **MOVED** (J. Wallace, D. Hornsby) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1349: R-ADM-General-Section 12. Transfers from Quebec CEGEPs effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

##### Admission Requirements for C. J. I. I. C. transferring into B. J.

It was **MOVED** (J. Wallace, N. Hagigi) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1375: R-ADM-Program-B.J. effective for the 2025-26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Admission Regulations for C. J. I. I. C.

It was **MOVED** (J. Wallace, B. O'Neill) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-2306: R-ADM-Program-C.J.I.I.C effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Items for Information

- Undergraduate minor modifications for February 4, 2025
- Graduate minor modifications for February 4, 2025
- Undergraduate minor modifications for February 18, 2025

There was no discussion of these items.

**b) Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC)**

Committee Chair David Hornsby presented 2 cyclical review reports, 15 major modifications, and one revised policy for Senate approval, plus minor modifications from Dominican University College for information.

Cyclical Reviews:

Omnibus Motion:

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, R. Renfro) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries arising from the Cyclical Reviews of the undergraduate and graduate programs as indicated.

The motion **PASSED**.

Motions within the Omnibus:

- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Business.
- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Journalism.

### Major Modifications:

#### Undergraduate Programs in Canadian Studies:

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, A. Bowker) that Senate approve the deletion of the undergraduate programs in Canadian Studies as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

#### Discussion:

The Chair of SQAPC clarified that the specific programs in Canadian studies targeted for closure include:

- Bachelor of Arts (Canadian Studies)
- Bachelor of Arts, Honours (Canadian Studies)
- Bachelor of Arts, combined honours (Canadian studies)
- Mention Française
- Minor in Quebec Studies

These programs are closing due to steep decline in enrolments combined with a shortage of qualified faculty members. The Dean of FASS added that the Minor in Canadian Studies is paused for revamping, and will be reopened next year.

A Senator asked if all of these programs could be paused rather than closed; the Dean responded that the programs marked for closure have very small enrolments and no resources to continue. Moving forward, the focus will be on the Master's program and possibly the minor at the undergraduate level. The Dean also emphasized that Canadian Studies content is continuing; courses will still be offered and the minor will return.

Another Senator noted that robust documentation with a full rationale and justification for the program closure with data on enrolment numbers was not supplied at FASS Faculty Board. The Senator added that they had wanted to bring a motion for Senators to have this information presented whenever a motion to close a program was brought for Senate approval, but they were told that these questions would have been raised and addressed during the curriculum review process.

The Chair of SQAPC noted that their committee receives full rationale and justification from the Dean plus decisions from the Faculty Curriculum Committee and Faculty Board. A robust conversation at SQAPC takes all of these into account. The SQAPC Chair added that by the time the documentation reaches SQAPC, committee members are confident

that the Faculty Board, curriculum committee, Dean's Office and the relevant Department have given the matter fair consideration. The Chair of SCCASP added that their meetings always include representation from Admissions to add more information and perspective to the discussion.

It was noted that faculty members do have the right to request more data at their departmental and Faculty Board meetings in order to make informed decisions on these closures. Deans should also be ready to answer these questions on the Senate floor. The Dean of FASS agreed to provide more fulsome data at future Faculty Board meetings for any additional program closures.

A Senator remarked that changes within Canadian Studies have occurred as a result of a series of decisions over the years, one of which was to move Indigenous Studies out of the School and have it join the Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies. The Provost noted that Indigenous Studies was moved out of the School at the request of Indigenous faculty, who no longer felt comfortable under the rubric of something called "Canada" given their own considerations around sovereignty. The School always had a very small complement of faculty, and when several of them moved into administrative roles (Provost, Deputy Provost) they were not replaced. Finally, the Provost noted in closing the discussion, that the School voted as a department in favour of closing these programs.

The motion **PASSED**.

To expedite the process, the remaining 14 major modification motions were combined into one omnibus motion.

#### Omnibus Motion – Major Modifications

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, L. Kostiuk) that Senate approve the major modifications as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

#### Individual motions from the omnibus:

- **MECT 4907**

**THAT** Senate approve the introduction of MECT 4907 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **Undergraduate Certificate in Journalism in Indigenous Communities**  
**THAT** Senate approve the introduction of the undergraduate Certificate in Journalism in Indigenous Communities and JOUR 1107 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **Undergraduate Programs in Music**  
**THAT** Senate approve the major modification to the undergraduate programs in Music and MUSI 4800, 4801 and 4908 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **BEng: Architectural Conservation and Sustainability Engineering**  
**THAT** Senate approve the deletion of the BEng: Architectural Conservation and Sustainability Engineering Streams A & B as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **GDIP Economic Policy**  
**THAT** Senate approve the deletion of the Graduate Diploma in Economic Policy as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **MARCH**  
**THAT** Senate approve the major modification to the MArch programs and the introduction of ARCH 5555 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **MPPA Collaborative Specialization in Climate Change**  
**THAT** Senate approve the introduction of the Collaborative Specialization in Climate Change to the MPPA program as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **MA Women's and Gender Studies Collaborative Specialization in Accessibility**  
**THAT** Senate approve the major modification to the MA in Women's and Gender Studies with Collaborative Specialization in Accessibility as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **DATA 5913**  
**THAT** Senate approve the introduction of DATA 5913 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **PhD. Data Science, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence**  
**THAT** Senate approve the major modification to the PhD in Data Science, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **GDIP European and Russian Studies**  
**THAT** Senate approve the change in the Graduate diploma name to European, Russian and Eurasian Studies as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **MCS: Data Science Analytics and Artificial Intelligence**  
**THAT** Senate approve the major modification to the MCS in Data Science, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **Undergraduate programs in Earth Sciences**  
**THAT** Senate approve the major modification to the undergraduate programs in Earth Sciences as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **Undergraduate programs in Architecture**  
**THAT** Senate approve the major modification to the to the BAS programs in Architecture as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

#### Co-op Policy

The Senate Co-operative Education Option Policy was updated regarding timelines, roles and responsibilities. A track-change copy showing the changes was circulated in advance to Senators.

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, C. Viau) that Senate approve the revised Co-operative Education Policy as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

#### DUC Minor Modifications

As part of the affiliation agreement with the Dominican University College (DUC), Carleton University plays a role in curriculum and program review and approvals at Dominican University College. Minor modifications are approved by DUC and presented to Carleton's Senate for information. These minor modifications were circulated in advance to Senators via Appendix 5.

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

Committee Chair Elinor Sloan presented two motions: one to approve a revised FPGA Faculty Board Constitution and the other to approve the dis-establishment of the Senate Library Committee.

FPGA Faculty Board Constitution:

In June of 2023 Senate passed a motion requiring all disciplinary Faculty Boards to revise their constitutions, to support the transfer of authority for graduate curriculum approvals from the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs to the disciplinary Faculties. The revised constitutions are brought to SAGC for review, and then to Senate for approval. In order to align the constitutions in terms of format, a template was developed and has been adopted by SAGC in its review. The FPGA Faculty Board Constitution has been revised in accordance with this template, reviewed by SAGC, and approved by the FPGA Faculty Board.

It was **MOVED** (E. Sloan, B. O'Neill) that Senate approve the Faculty Board Constitution of the Faculty of Public and Global Affairs, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Library Committee:

The Clerk presented a motion to dis-establish the Senate Library Committee. Although the Senate Library Committee (SLC) has been in existence for over 70 years, SAGC noted that the committee's usefulness as an advisory body has steadily declined over the years as new mechanisms for more effective consultation with departments and faculty members have emerged. It was also noted that the link between SLC and Senate has also diminished, and that SLC meetings are poorly attended. To maintain and strengthen the connection between the Library and Senate, SAGC is also proposing that the Senate Review Committee's mandate be revised to include a review of the annual University Library Report, following a process similar to its review of the Enrolment Report and Operating Budget. SAGC members maintain that this would provide Senators with opportunities for deeper engagement with the University Library Report.

It was **MOVED** (E. Sloan, M. Haines) that the Senate Library Committee be dis-established and the Senate Review Committee's Terms of Reference be amended to include a review of a University Library Report annually prior to the report's presentation to Senate.

Discussion:

A Senator revealed that they had received an email from some members of the Senate Library Committee who objected to the decision to dis-establish the committee, noting



that the proposed solution with the Senate Review Committee would be a one-way engagement process that does not provide enough critical engagement with users. The Senator asked if there could be a renewal of the committee with a revised Terms of Reference. Another Senator suggested that perhaps this committee might be reimagined and continue its life outside of the Senate structure. Several Senators objected to the dis-establishment and asked for other solutions to be brought forward or more time to consider the future of the committee.

The Clerk reminded Senators of the robust discussion at Senate in January as a result of the Senate Review Committee's review of the Enrolment Report. This type of engagement can raise the profile of the Library to Senators and increase the connection to Senate, a connection that is lacking in the current structure.

Another Senator noted that creating another committee with the same representation would not necessarily yield better results. In their previous experience with the SLC, the Senator noted that it was difficult to achieve quorum, members were not engaged, and often did not understand their role. The Senator noted that there are now well established and effective avenues for engaging with the Faculties, and for addressing concerns directly with faculty members at the departmental level. The University Librarian also has opportunities to discuss issues with the Deans and the Provost.

The discussion came to a close and the Chair called the question.

The motion **PASSED**.

## **8. University Funding: A Primer (Provost)**

The Provost provided a presentation to Senate on university funding, in response to a series of questions submitted in January by Senator Sean Burges. The presentation was divided into two sections: information on funding from the Ontario government, and how funding flows within the university.

### Funding from the Ontario Government:

Questions from Senator Burges:

- How does enrolment at the University translate into funding flows from the Province?

- How much of the University's funding (nominal and percentage) from the Province comes in the form of a "block grant" and a "student enrolment contingent grant"?
- Can you please explain how enrolment-based funding from the Province to the University is calculated and under what envelopes it falls?
- Is there a limit to how much operating funding the University can get from the Province by increasing enrolments?

Operating grants from the government are set every five years through Strategic Mandate Agreements (SMA) that are negotiated individually with the Ministry. Carleton is currently finishing SMA3 (2020-25). SMAs assign weighted grant units (WGUs) to universities. These are calculated according to undergraduate enrolment levels with some negotiated growth, but they translate into a fixed funding amount.

**Weighted Grant Units:** each student is assigned a WGU value that varies according to program. Upper year undergraduate students are weighted more than lower-year undergraduates, as are students in Engineering and Science, since these programs require more resources to run. PhD students have the highest weighting.

**Corridor Model:** Enrolment corridors are set as part of the SMA negotiations. Planned growth is estimated for a 5-year period, and that growth is assigned a floor, a midpoint and a ceiling (+/- 3%). If the enrolment falls below the floor level, the university risks losing some government funding; if the enrolment rises above the midpoint level, the university may still collect tuition, but would receive no WGUs for those students.

The average Canadian university receives from its provincial government approximately \$16,000 for each full-time domestic student registered. Ontario provides the lowest grant per student in the country, at half the national average (\$8,000). Because of this funding deficit, Ontario universities are currently accepting 28,000 domestic students for whom they receive tuition but no provincial funding, since these student enrolments are above the corridor. The issue is exacerbated by the fact that more and more of these enrolments are in STEM programs which are more expensive to run. Unless the situation improves, it is estimated that by 2030, the number of un-funded students will grow to 100,000.

Carleton's 2023-24 operating grant was \$180,761,204.00 which breaks down to:

- 39.5% Core Operating Grant (corridor based)
- 7.4% Special Purpose Grants (enrolment based) (e.g. Indigenous support, mental health support)

- -1.4% International Student Recovery (claw-back on enrolment for International students)
- 54.5% Performance/Student Success Grant (corridor based) Based on criteria specified in the SMA such as graduate employment rate, experiential learning, graduate employment earnings, etc.

#### Funding Flows Within the University:

##### Questions from Senator Burges:

- How does the university calculate the funding that flows to a department/program on a per student enrolled in said department/program basis?
- How does the university calculate the funding that flows to a department/program for each student enrolled in a class delivered by that department/program?
- How does the funding flowing to an academic department/program translate into resources available for planning and delivering education and student enrichment?

Carleton uses an incremental budget model with a built-in Enrolment-Linked Budget Allocation (ELBA) mechanism. There are 11 Resource Planning Committees at Carleton (5 Faculties, 4 Vice-Presidents, President and Library). Incremental budgeting means that each Resource Planning Committee receives a base allocation of resources each year, based on historical patterns. If there is enrolment growth, that revenue is shared with Faculties using the ELBA formula:

- Net revenue = tuition + grant – scholarship cost
- 40% of year-over-year change in net revenue flows to Faculties. 60% is retained by the Central administration.
- Of the 40% to Faculties, 60% is attributed to course enrolments and 40% to student majors.

ELBA is distributed to Faculties, and the Deans then decide how to allocate these funds to individual units.

Discussion after the presentation focussed mainly on the Weighted Grant Unit calculations, in clarifying how these calculations are made and the assumption that some programs cost more to run. The Chair acknowledged that there is more depth and nuance to this topic, that is beyond the scope of this presentation.

The Chair thanked the Provost for the presentation and Senators for their engagement.

**9. Motion from Senator Jody Mason**

Due to lack of time, this motion was postponed to the next meeting (March 28, 2025).

**10. Reports for Information**

- a) Senate Executive Minutes (January 21, 2025)
- b) Senate Undergraduate Student Awards Committee – Report on New Awards

These items were not discussed.

**11. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**19. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned (D. Howe, J. Mason) at 4:04 p.m.