



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. Dragunoiu, 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 SSHRC 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 4,000 to 5,000 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 OPAVPA, 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 January 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.