Carleton University Senate
Meeting of September 20, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.
Senate Room, Robertson Hall

AGENDA

Closed Session:
1. Welcome
2. Report from Honorary Degrees Committee
3. CUISC Draft Recommendations

Open Session:
1. Welcome and Introduction of New Members
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes:
   a) June 21, 2019
4. Chair’s Remarks
5. Question Period
6. Senate Administration (Clerk):
   a) Senate and Senate Committee Membership Ratification
   b) Senate Survey Report
   c) Report on Appointments made Contrary to Advertising Procedures
7. Reports:
   a) SCCASP – Amnesty Policy
8. SIP and SMA Update
9. Reports for Information:
   a) Senate Executive Minutes
      i) June 7, 2019
      ii) E-polls: June 4, 2019; June 5, 2019
   b) Senate Library Committee – Annual Report 2018-19

10. Other Business

10. Adjournment
1. Welcome

The Chair welcomed Senators to the final Senate meeting of the 2018/19 academic year, and began the session by acknowledging that the land on which Carleton sits is the traditional and unceded territory of the Algonquin People. The Chair noted that June 21 is National Indigenous Peoples Day. Because June is also National Pride month, the Rainbow Pride flag has been raised outside of Dunton Tower.

The Chair noted some highlights of Carleton’s recent Convocation:

- 4800+ students received their degrees over 9 ceremonies.
- Seven honorary degrees were awarded; recipients included Yazmine Laroche and the Rt. Hon. Paul Martin, and
- The new Chancellor, Yaprak Baltacıoğlu, was installed.
The Chair thanked all who attended and/or contributed to this year’s Convocation.

The Chair acknowledged and thanked a number of Senators who are concluding their Senate term this month:

- Jeff Smith (Academic colleague)
- Jack Coghill (Alumni Representative)
- Board members:
  - Nik Nanos
  - Beth Creary
- Faculty members:
  - Jeffrey Erochko
  - Mariana Esponda
  - Nathan Grasse
  - John Hayes
  - Wayne Horne
  - Susanne Klausen
  - Anil Maheshwari
  - Petra Watzlawik-Li
- 5 students:
  - Taylor Arnt
  - Aprile Harrison
  - Bashar Hnidi
  - Scott Kroff
  - Brendan O’Malley

The Chair also thanked the ex officio members who will not be returning to Senate next year:

- Lorraine Dyke, who will move to a new role as Deputy Provost (Academic Operations & Planning) on July 1st
- Linda Schweitzer, who has served 2 years as Interim Dean of the Sprott School of Business,
- Fred Afagh, who served as Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Design for 2.5 years, and
- Matthias Neufang, who is moving on from his position as Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Post-doctoral Affairs, a post he held for 5 years.

The Chair thanked all outgoing Senators for their service.

The Chair acknowledged that 2018-19 was a busy year for Senate, with full meetings and engaged discussions.
2. Approval of agenda (open)
It was MOVED (M. Neufang, F. Afagh) that Senate approve the open agenda for the meeting of Senate on June 21, 2019, as presented.

It was noted that the Library Report under Item 10(b) should be omitted from the agenda as it was not received by the Senate Office. The motion PASSED, with this modification.

3. Approval of minutes – May 31, 2019
It was MOVED (L. Schweitzer, J. Erochko) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting on May 31, 2019, as presented.

Three small corrections to the attendance record were noted by the Senate Office. A Senator also requested a correction in the wording of an amendment under Item 7(d) on page 6.

The motion PASSED with these changes.

4. Matters Arising
There were none.

5. Chair’s Remarks
The Chair discussed strategic planning, and included a presentation to accompany his remarks (see attached pdf). He began with a review of the past strategic plan (Collaboration, Leadership and Resilience 2013-18), specifically noting the successful achievement of the 10 goals of the plan. (See pdf for details.) The Chair then introduced four co-chairs who will be leading the process for developing a new SIP: Betina Appel Kuzmarov (Clerk of Senate), Cindy Taylor (Assistant Vice-President – Human Resources), Lorraine Dyke (Deputy Provost, Academic Operations & Planning), and Patrice Smith (Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs). Lorraine Dyke, one of the co-chairs, outlined the timeline of the process, which will include the following steps:

- Creation of a Task Force of 12 – 15 people, broadly representative of campus, through an open Call for Nominations over the summer. The Task Force will include and be led by the four co-chairs.
- Inclusion of a Speaker Series, beginning this fall, to focus on trends and issues in Higher Education.
- Launch of the process in September; website opened for input.
- Broad consultations across campus and engagement with internal and external stakeholders throughout the Fall.
• Strategic directions identified in December; draft plan created in January and then opened to the public for comments.
• Further consultations in March and April
• Finalized SIP created in April and brought to Senate and Board of Governors for approval in May.

The Co-Chairs are looking for the following input from Senators:
  • Comments on the process and timeline
  • Recommended themes for the consultation sessions
  • Recommendations for Speakers

Suggestions and feedback from Senators:
  • Themes for consultations should include research directions and teaching directions.
  • The lack of permanent teaching positions for Contract Instructors should be addressed in this process.
  • Consultations should involve unions on campus, and should include staff, contract instructors, and Indigenous voices.
  • The process should highlight what we do well and should align with our reputation.

A Senator asked how the SIP relates to the Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA), which is negotiated with the Provincial Government. The Chair responded that the SMA timeline is not yet known, but the agreement will be based on the Strategic Integrated Plan and will be a subset of it.

In closing, the Chair thanked Senators for their feedback and the four co-Chairs for their leadership.

6. Question Period
Questions submitted with regards to the Carnegie Classification were discussed under agenda item #9a.

7. Administration
   a. Senate membership ratification (2019/20)

   It was MOVED (B. Kuzmarov, P. Smith) that Senate ratify the appointment of Farah Hosseinian as elected member of Senate from the Faculty of Science, with effect from July 1, 2019, for a term of 3 years.
   The motion PASSED.
b. Senate Survey Results

To bring Carleton’s Senate in line with best practices in the sector, the Secretariat Office has initiated an annual Senate Survey, to gather feedback from Senators and look for areas of improvement in our processes.

Our first Senate Survey was distributed electronically to Senators on May 23rd and was available for responses until May 30th. There were 7 multiple choice questions plus opportunities for general comments and suggestions. The response rate was 47%, and included many comments in addition to the responses to individual questions.

The Clerk thanked Senators for the feedback, which will inform Senate planning for next year. A high-level review of the results indicates that Senators are engaged, informed, and prepared for meetings, but many feel that documentation and document delivery could be streamlined. Some Senators also thought that the Senate Orientation could be improved. The Clerk indicated that improvements to these areas will be made for 2019-20 and an Orientation for committee chairs is also being considered for next year.

A more complete written report of the results of the survey will be shared with Senators in the Fall of 2019.

8. Reports
   a. Student Awards Committee

The Clerk of Senate reported on this item, as the Chair of the committee was unable to attend the Senate meeting.

The Senate Committee on Student Awards is tasked with considering and recommending to Senate the acceptance of preferred undergraduate scholarships, awards, loan funds and bursary funds.

A memo outlining changes to existing undergraduate awards and the proposed terms of reference for 39 new awards was circulated to Senators. This memo is a companion document to the committee report, which had been circulated to Senators in May.

Of the 39 new awards proposed, 2 are entrance scholarships, 6 are in-course scholarships, 11 are departmental scholarships, 17 are new bursaries, and 3 are Athletics awards. The memo also proposes changes to the terms of reference for four departmental scholarship and one general scholarship.
It was **MOVED** (B. Kuzmarov, S. Shires) that Senate approve the terms of reference for 39 new undergraduate awards and changes to five existing undergraduate awards, as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

**b. Senate Honorary Degrees Committee**

Committee Chair Rafik Goubran presented two proposed changes to the Honorary Degrees Policy. The first change would extend the period of time that approved candidates could remain on the active list, from 3 years to 5 years, in order to allow enough time to schedule a receipt of the degree at a Convocation ceremony. The second change relates to the notification process. Currently, once Senate approves the nominee, the nominator is informed of the decision. However, this can often compromise the confidentiality of the process, as the nominee only receives the honorary degree once it has been scheduled by the President’s Office, which can occur months or even years after the approval at Senate. As a result, the committee is proposing that the nominator of an approved candidate should only be notified once the President’s office has confirmed a scheduled time for the awarding of the honorary degree, and not before.

It was **MOVED** (R. Goubran, F. Afagh) that Senate approve the changes to the Honorary Degree Policy, as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

**c. Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admissions and Studies Policy**

Dwight Deugo spoke to this report as the Chair of SCCASP, Howard Nemiroff, was unable to attend the Senate meeting. There was 1 item for information and 2 items for approval.

**Items for approval:**
SCCASp is proposing the addition of a math (calculus) requirement to the B.Com. and BIB programs, to bring them in line with other programs.

It was **MOVED** (B. Kuzmarov, M. Neufang) that Senate approve the regulation changes to the B.Com. Program for the 2020/21 calendar, as presented.

It was **MOVED** (B. Kuzmarov, M. Neufang) that Senate approve the regulation changes to the BIB Program for the 2020/21 calendar, as presented.
Discussion:
A Senator noted that the normal 10-day notice of motion period was not followed for this memo as Senators only received the materials 3 days before the meeting. The Clerk noted the procedural issue, and through discussion it was determined that the conditions were met for a waiver of notice of motion.

It was **MOVED** (K. Evans, K. von Finckenstein) that Senate waive the notice of motion requirement for the motion presented by the Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admission and Studies Policy to approve regulation changes to the B.Com. and BIB programs as presented. The motion **PASSED** with a 2/3 approval, with 1 opposed and 1 abstention.

The original motions (above) **PASSED**.

Item for Information:
SCCASP has been considering comments from Senators regarding the Amnesty Policy, and will be discussing the policy at the SCCASP retreat in August. The revised policy will be brought to Senate for discussion and approval in September.

d. Senate Academic Program Committee:

Cyclical Reviews:

It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, L. Schweitzer) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in the Sprott School of Business. The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, C. Macdonald) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate programs in Biology. The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, A. Plourde) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the graduate programs in Sustainable Energy. The motion **PASSED**.
IQAP (Institutional Quality Assurance Process)

Vice-Provost Lorraine Dyke presented an overview of the revised IQAP that was circulated to Senators with the meeting package. She reminded Senators that each Ontario university is required to produce its own IQAP that must meet provincial protocols. The IQAP is ratified by the Quality Council, which is the final authority on our IQAP and the approval of new programs.

Carleton’s IQAP initially was approved by Senate in 2010, was ratified by the Quality Council in 2011, and was expanded in 2012 to include the Dominican University College. Improvements were made in 2013 that were approved by Senate in 2015. Carleton’s IQAP was last audited in 2014.

A timeline of consultations leading to the current proposed revisions was outlined. After approval at Senate, the new IQAP will be approved by the Quality Council in August with the goal of implementation in September.

Key objectives of the new IQAP:
- reduce burden on academic units,
- shorten process,
- eliminate unnecessary committee burdens,
- incorporate best practices, and
- clarify roles and responsibilities.

Major changes included replacing CUCQA and SAPC with SQAPC (Senate Quality Assurance and Program Committee), eliminating the peer review process, and streamlining stages, reporting and major modification tracks. Details are available in the revised IQAP.

SQAPC membership recommendations:
- Add Associate Dean of Programs in FGPA (Grad studies stands in place of the line faculty board for graduate studies.)
- Members of the committee should have experience in administration of graduate and/or undergraduate programs and should have established and continuing research records.
- Correction: Calendar Manager should be Calendar Editor.

Other changes in the IQAP:
- Appendices containing lists of programs in scope were replaced by criteria that define in-scope programs.
- Definitions were removed, since these definitions are already contained in the Calendar Glossary.
- Unnecessary repetition was eliminated.
Other process changes outside the actual text of the IQAP include the following:

- New templates were created for the cyclical review process (with page limits).
- Separate resource guides were developed.
- Tighter timelines and clearer deadlines were established for cyclical reviews.
- Site visits can be pre-booked prior to completion of self-study.
- For multi-faculty programs, one Dean finalizes feedback.
- Accreditation has been aligned with the cyclical review process in Sprott and Engineering (other programs to be confirmed).
- Library reports were eliminated where not needed.

Corrections to the IQAP document circulated to Senate:

- P15: 3.5.7: “…office of the Vice-Provost shall assign the documents” (instead of brief)
- P33: 7.2.11.1 “…office of the Vice-Provost shall assign the documents” (instead of brief)

It was **MOVED** (L. Dyke, A. Plourde) that a friendly amendment be made to the motion to incorporate these changes. Senators accepted the amendment as friendly.

It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, C. Macdonald) that Senate approve the revised version of Carleton’s ICAP, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

There was no discussion.

**9. Community Engagement Presentations:**

**a. Carnegie Classification Pilot Project (cont’d)**

Vice-Provost Lorraine Dyke answered questions submitted by Senator Paulson as a follow-up to last week’s presentation on the Carnegie Classification project:

1. What does it cost Carleton to receive and maintain this classification? The fee is approximately $10,000. Staffing costs would be approximately $40,000.
2. What would be expected of Carleton to keep the classification? The classification must be renewed every 5 years for reclassification.
3. a) Will there be top-down requirements on how faculty incorporate community engagement into their classrooms or programs?
   No

   b) Will decision making powers regarding community engagement’s relationship to our academic mission be subsumed by this program? There will be no impact on decision making powers of Senate or BOG.

4. Are there mechanisms in place to prevent gaming of the system?
   We are only able to submit the names of 15 partners to be surveyed. This will be a subset of our large partnership pool. For example, Sprott alone has over 300 partners. The classification does not drive our engagement work. Rather, our Community Engagement work is driving our desire for the classification.

   The Chair noted that Carleton University was founded by and for the community in 1942. Carleton is well positioned to take advantage of and build upon this long history of community engagement. The Carnegie Classification is a way for Carleton to gain recognition for something we already do well.

b. Hub for Good

   Ryan Davies, Director of Advancement Strategy and Brand, and representative from the Community Engagement Steering Committee, presented an overview of the proposed “Hub for Good,” a new community partnership and engagement portal based on the successful Future Funder model used by Carleton’s Department of Advancement for fundraising. The Hub for Good would function as a visible front door to facilitate external partnerships.

   Development of this HUB will progress over 3 broad phases.

   Phase 1 - (achieved) Establish a live portal for community engagement at Hub for Good. The HUB routes users to existing opportunities for community engagement such as research partnerships, coop opportunities, and philanthropy. This portal was launched with Propel initiative in mid-May.

   Phase 2 - over the next 18 months - Develop a timely user-led platform for community engagement similar to the Future Funder platform. Individual groups will be able to put forward ideas for partnerships through the portal. Approval protocols have yet to be developed, as do measures for success and
accountability. These will be developed through consultations with the university community, which will begin in September.

Phase 3 – Spring 2020 – External partners will be asked to submit ideas via the portal. Processes will be in place to adjudicate and assign partnerships based on agreed protocols.

Discussion:
A Senator asked if there are existing models for this process. Mr. Davies noted that Simon Fraser has been a model because of its broad community engagement but Carleton is the first university to develop this unique process. A number of charities also have served as resources for this model (as, for example, in volunteer matching).

Another Senator asked for examples of community engagement that could be accessed through this model. Fundraising is one possibility, but the platform has the potential to broaden partnerships beyond one dimension. The portal is a vehicle for connecting people. Research partnerships, coop opportunities, SEO volunteers in community for service learning, etc. are all current possibilities. Areas for research and working with students are already included. More opportunities can be identified through the consultation process.

Others asked about protocols to determine the appropriateness of projects, given the decentralization of process. Will there be safeguards to prevent embarrassments to the university?

Another Senator suggested that the text around accessing research on the current site, which is mostly STEM oriented, could be broader in its representation.

10. Reports for Information:
   a. Senate Executive Committee Minutes (March 19, 2019; April 16, 2019; May 21, 2019)

   b. Senate committee Annual Reports (SAIAC, Student Awards, Library Committee)

Senators appreciated the detail and recommendations of the report from the Senate Student Academic Integrity Appeals Committee (SAIAC). A Senator asked if the idea of an Honor Code and Zero Tolerance Policy could be brought to Senate in September for further discussion. Another Senator asked about more specific issues with academic integrity in lab coursework. The Clerk noted that these responses would be brought back to the Chair of
SAIAC and the recommendations would be taken to the appropriate Senate committee(s) for development before returning to Senate for discussion and approval(s).

11. Other Business

A Senator asked about flying an Indigenous/Algonquin flag on campus. The Chair noted that a response will be provided at the next Senate meeting.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00 noon.
Question Period Submissions
Carleton University Senate: Meeting of September 20, 2019

Question from M. Rooney

Over the last decade, Carleton University Senate has taken some significant steps towards integrating Contract Instructors (CIs), adding two CI Senators and, more recently, making concrete efforts to ensure representation from CIs on special committees such as those on free speech and the Senate’s committee structure. While these are positive and welcome developments, however, CIs remain underrepresented on Senate: if the Senate membership information on our website is up to date, for instance, CIs hold the dubious distinction of being, percentage wise, the least represented group on campus (2.7%). One consequence of the current arrangement is that our two CI Senators take turns serving on alternating ad hoc or special committees, placing an undue burden on them that no other subgroup of Senators face – because those groups have more representatives, they can distribute the work among a greater number of Senators. The current arrangement also makes it impossible for CIs to be represented in all or most of the Senate’s regular standing committees.

Given 1) Senate’s and CIs’ salutary desire to include CIs in ad hoc or special committees, 2) the paucity of CI Senators available to serve and the burden such work places on two CI Senators, and 3) expressions of support for improving conditions for CIs that elected faculty Senators expressed explicitly in our June 2019 Senate meeting (when we discussed the next SIP), I ask: will the relevant Senate committee review (and report back on) CI representation on Senate, with special attention to the question of adding additional CI Senators in numbers that 1) reflect CIs’ presence on campus and contributions to the university, and that 2) put them on par, representation wise, with other groups such as our students (who have ten Senators – seven undergraduate, three graduate)? Will we consider adding, for instance, at least three new CI Senators?

Question from H. Gupta

Carleton sits on the stolen Omamiwinini Land, otherwise known as Algonquin territory. This acknowledgement is more than a theory, it is a growing process in which we all participate. According
to the “canadian” census, there are over 25,000 Indigenous people’s living in Ottawa. Many of them have found themselves on our campus. Systemic and institutional racism including lack of access to funding and limited cultural support many times prevent the success of Indigenous students in post-secondary education. Creating a space in this senate’s chambers will provide Carleton an opportunity to listen to these concerns from students themselves.

Will the Senate take initiative to create an indigenous graduate student senator position?
MOTION: That Senate ratify the following new Senate and Senate committee appointments, as presented.

SENATE:

Faculty Members

• Olga Baysal – Computer Science
• Pamela Wolff - Science
• Naomi Cappuccino – Science (Faculty Board Secretary)

Special Appointments

• Margaret Haines – Alumni Representative
• Kim Hellemans – Academic Colleague

Students

• Julia Bruno (FASS)
• Zack Kryworuchka (FASS)

SENATE COMMITTEES:

Senate Executive Committee

• Winnie Ye (Faculty member)
• Anne Bowker (Faculty member)
• Hemant Gupta (Graduate Student)
Senate Quality Assurance and Program Committee

- Daniel Siddiqi (Faculty member – FASS – Senator)
- Pamela Wolff (Faculty member – Science – Senator)
- Wei Shi (Faculty member – FED – Senator)
- Siva Sivathayalan (Faculty member – FED – Senator)
- Jonathan Malloy (Faculty member – FPA)
- Julia Wallace (Faculty member – Science)
- Peter Thompson (Faculty member – FASS)
- Merridee Bujaki (Faculty member – Sprott)

Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC)

- Samuel Ajila (Faculty member – Senator – FED)
- Johannes Wolfart (Faculty member – Senator – FASS)
- Daniel Siddiqi (Faculty member – Senator – FASS)

Senate Library Committee

- Anne Bowker – Faculty member and Chair (FASS)

Senate Committee on Student Awards

- Farah Hosseinian – Faculty representative

Senate Honorary Degrees Committee

- Nicolas Papadopoulos (Sprott faculty representative)

Senate Review Committee

- Farah Hosseinian (Faculty member – Science)
- Justin Paulson (Faculty member – FASS)
Senate Survey Results

September 20, 2019
Overview

• May 2019: First ever Senate Survey created by Office of Secretariat / Senate Office under direction of Clerk of Senate

• Goals:
  • Receive informative feedback from Senators on their experience serving in academic governance
  • Facilitate development of best practices in academic governance
  • Develop a more open and responsive Senate
Overview

- Invitations sent May 23, 2019
- Survey closed May 30, 2019 at 11:59 pm
- Response rate: 47% (39/82 Senators responded)
Overview

Content: 7 questions + Comments Field

Categories:
- Attendance, preparedness, engagement (Q1)
- Orientation (Q2,3)
- Meetings (structure, length, tone) (Q4)
- Communications and Documents (Q5-7)
Question 1: Self Evaluation

1. I understand Senate policies and procedures:
   - Always: 12
   - Mostly: 20
   - Sometimes: 6
   - Rarely: 1

2. I participate effectively in meetings:
   - Always: 12
   - Mostly: 12
   - Sometimes: 12
   - Rarely: 3

3. I review documentation in advance:
   - Always: 17
   - Mostly: 18
   - Sometimes: 2
   - Rarely: 2

4. I attend all meetings or send regrets:
   - Always: 30
   - Mostly: 6
   - Sometimes: 3
Question 2: Orientation Attendance

Did you attend orientation?

- Yes
- No
Question 3: Orientation Breakdown

ORIENTATION HELPFUL ME UNDERSTAND MY ROLE AS SENATOR

- Strongly Agree: 9
- Agree: 7
- Neutral: 7
- Disagree: 1
- Strongly Disagree: 1

ORIENTATION WAS APPROPRIATE AND ADEQUATE

- Strongly Agree: 8
- Agree: 10
- Neutral: 5
- Disagree: 1
- Strongly Disagree: 1
Question 4: Meetings

- **Climate of Mutual Respect and Meaningful Participation**
  - Strongly Agree: 20
  - Agree: 15
  - Neutral: 4
  - Disagree: 4

- **Business is Dealt with Effectively, Appropriately & in Timely Manner**
  - Strongly Agree: 12
  - Agree: 21
  - Neutral: 6

- **Time for Discussion & Debate is Adequate**
  - Strongly Agree: 12
  - Agree: 79
  - Neutral: 4

- **Appropriate Length and Frequency**
  - Strongly Agree: 16
  - Agree: 20
  - Neutral: 5
  - Disagree: 2
### Question 5: Communications & Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Senate summaries are useful and concise</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate website is well organized</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation is understandable and decisions are clearly defined</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document delivery system is easy to use</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation is appropriate in quantity and content</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes are clear, accurate &amp; useful</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 6: Website Use

How many times did you visit the Senate website this year?

- Never: 4
- 1-4 times: 21
- 5-9 times: 11
- More than 10 times: 3
Question 7: Why you visited the website
Conclusions

• Senators are engaged and are prepared for meetings
• Senators are satisfied with the tone, structure and length of Senate meetings
• Senators are satisfied with the quality and accuracy of the minutes
• Senators have no major criticisms of the website and/or *Inside Senate* summaries
Conclusions

• Meeting materials could be more accessible
  • Memos summarizing documents could be improved for clarity
  • Binders could be more user-friendly
  • New options in document delivery platforms and formats could be explored

• Orientation and onboarding of Senators could be improved
  • Orientation materials need to be updated and expanded
  • Video and other materials could be available to new Senators who miss the Orientation session
Questions and Further Comments

• Betina Appel Kuzmarov, Clerk of Senate
  • 613-520-2600 x8810
  • clerkofsenate@Carleton.ca

• Kathy McKinley, Assistant University Secretary
  • 613-520-2600 x3386
  • Kathy.mckinley@Carleton.ca
MEMORANDUM
From the Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admission and Studies Policy

To: Senate
From: Howard Nemiroff, Chair of SCCASP
Date: September 20, 2019
Subject: 2020-21 Academic Regulations Changes

For Senate approval

1. Letter of Permission guidelines.

Motion: That Senate adopt the Letter of Permission proposal as presented

Attachment(s): Letter-of-Permission-Guide

For Discussion

1. Amnesty Motion: Carleton University Senate Policy on the Academic Implications of Labour Disputes Sept 20 2019
Application Process
Applications are through Carleton Central. Application dates and deadlines are: 4 weeks prior to the start of the term of the Letter of Permission course(s) at the Host Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer registration:</th>
<th>January 1 to March 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall registration:</td>
<td>April 1 to July 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter registration:</td>
<td>April 1 to November 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many institutions will ask you to submit an application for visiting student status and provide you with appropriate dates for registration.

Please note: there are no deadlines for Athabasca University as the start dates for courses occur throughout the year.

Course Descriptions
Course descriptions should be cut and pasted from the host university website or online calendar.

Application and Tuition Fees

- A non-refundable application processing fee will be charged to your student account when you submit your online application. Please visit the Registrar’s Office website for current fee listings.

- Tuition fees are paid to the host institution.

Conditions of Approval for an LOP
1. You must be in Good Standing in a degree program.
2. You must present the minimum CGPA for graduation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall CGPA*</th>
<th>Major(s)</th>
<th>Concentration or Specialization</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours Degrees</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Degrees</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>not used</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major &amp; General Degrees, B.I.T.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture (Design), B.I.D.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>not used</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate Diploma</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: some programs have higher requirements.

3. Your proposed program must meet the following Carleton residence requirements:

- To be eligible for graduation with a Carleton degree, certificate, or post-baccalaureate diploma, each student must present a certain number of credits earned at Carleton University which have not been presented to fulfill any degree that has been previously awarded, including a degree or degrees at Carleton University. These are referred to as residency credits. Courses taken under the University of Ottawa Exchange Agreement do not count as residency credits.

- All degree students must present a minimum of 5.0 credits of residency credits. To be eligible for graduation with a general degree, these residency credits must include at least 3.0 credits that are both in the major and at the 2000-level or above. For honours degrees, these residency credits must include at least 3.0 credits that are both in the major and at the 3000-level or above. For combined honours programs the residency credits must include a minimum of 1.5 credits in each major and at the 3000-level or above.

- To be eligible for graduation with a minor, students must present a minimum of 2.0 credits of residency credits in each minor.

- Due to accreditation requirements, the minimum number of residency credits for students in the Faculty of Engineering and Design is half of the total number of credits required in the program.

- To obtain an undergraduate certificate from Carleton University, students must present residency credits including a minimum of 4.0 credits taken at Carleton including all required courses.

- To obtain a post-baccalaureate diploma from Carleton University, students must present residency credits including a minimum of 3.0 credits taken at Carleton.

4. You must have a major and the proposed course must be acceptable to your program. For example, you will not receive approval for a first-year course if you have already attained the maximum number of first-year courses for your program.
5. All degree students must have completed at least 4.03.0 credits at Carleton towards your current degree program;

6. Letter of Permission courses are counted as credits towards your overall course load in the term the course(s) are approved.

7. The course taken on Letter of Permission must be within a discipline that is taught at Carleton University;

8. Courses taken and passed at Carleton may not be repeated on a Letter of Permission;

9. Credit will not be given for equivalent courses taken in two different degree programs at the same time; if you are admitted into a degree program at the host institution, you forfeit degree standing at Carleton and your Letter of Permission becomes null and void;

10. You must meet the pre-requisite requirements for courses at the host institution and for the Carleton equivalents of those courses;

11. You must meet all terms and conditions as specified on the Letter of Permission. While studying on the Letter, you remain governed by all Carleton rules and regulations appropriate to your program. Failure to meet these terms could result in the Letter of Permission being declared null and void, and/or failing grades being assigned to your record;

12. You must be eligible to register in courses (no holds on your account preventing registration).

Transcripts from the Host Institution

You are responsible for arranging to have official transcripts sent to the Registrar’s Office upon completion of the course. The Registrar’s Office cannot accept photocopies, faxes, or letters. A grade of “UNS” will be assigned to any course for which an official transcript is not received. Transcripts are due by May 1 for fall/winter courses, and October 1 for spring/summer/intersession courses.

Graduation

If you choose to complete your final credit for graduation on a Letter of Permission, be aware of the following:

1. You must submit a formal application for graduation, which must be received in the Registrar’s Office no later than the official due date as published in the Undergraduate Calendar.

2. Since different universities have different schedules, it is possible that your transcript will arrive too late for processing before graduation. If this occurs, you will be notified that you must submit a new application for the next graduation.

Course Changes

Notify the Registrar’s Office immediately if the course you applied for is filled or cancelled when you arrive at the host institution. If you wish to apply for an alternate course, send the course information to your registrar specialist by email, and the Registrar’s Office will reassess your Letter of Permission (usually without further fee).

Withdrawing from Courses

Notify the Registrar’s Office in writing immediately if you withdraw from any of your courses or if you do not register in any of the courses listed on the Letter of Permission. Depending on how late in the term you report your withdrawal, you may be required to provide an official transcript from the host institution confirming your withdrawal. Failure to report your withdrawals will result in a grade of “UNS” on your record. Abandoning a course after the last date for withdrawal at the host institution will also result in a grade of “UNS.”

Your Carleton Transcript

Credit for courses taken on a Letter of Permission is recorded on a “pass” or “fail” basis. A passed course counts as an attempt, but will not be figured into your Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA). A failing grade earned on a Letter of Permission will be included in the calculation of discredits, but will not be calculated into your CGPA. Failing grades earned while on Letter of Permission will be assigned a grade of “UNS.”

Further Questions

If you have difficulty choosing courses, consult your major or honours supervisor in your department, or an academic advisor in the Academic Advising Centre, 302 Tory (520-7850). Bear in mind that only the Registrar’s Office can determine your eligibility for and issue a Letter of Permission.

Carleton University
Registrar’s Office
300 Tory Building, 1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
tel: (613) 520-3500 fax: (613) 520-4410

transcripts@carleton.ca
Definitions and Application

1.1 For the purposes of this policy, “Labour Disruption” means when academic activities are substantially interrupted as a result of a strike or lockout at Carleton University.

1.2 The term "academic activities" includes any work subject to evaluation or necessary for a student to meet the requirements and learning outcomes of a course or program of study.

1.3 Labour Disruptions of 10 or fewer calendar days will continue to be governed by normal academic regulations and policies.

1.4 In determining whether an interruption to academic activities is substantial, the following factors will be considered by Senate Executive:

   1.4.1 the duration and point in the term or session in which the Labour Disruption occurred;
   1.4.2 the availability of physical and instructional resources;
   1.4.3 the impact on the attendance of students, instructors, and other necessary participants;
   1.4.4 the impact of timing and sequence of evaluations such as examinations, practica, assignments and presentations.

2 Policy

2.1 Academic Standards and Quality
During a Labour Disruption, no dilution of standards normally expected of students is permitted.

2.2 Accommodation for Students
2.2.1 Students who cannot participate in academic activities because they are unable to do so due to a Labour Disruption, may be entitled to appropriate accommodations which could include reasonable alternative access to materials covered in their absence, reasonable extensions of deadlines, and such remedy as Senate deems necessary and consistent with the principle of maintaining high academic standards and quality for all programs.

2.2.2 Remedies shall not alter academic standards associated with the missed academic activities, including the course learning objectives and learning outcomes. Students are not relieved from the responsibility for mastering the materials covered and fulfilling course and program requirements.

2.2.3 The availability of a remedy under this policy does not guarantee students the same learning experience as they would have received in the absence of a Labour Disruption.

2.3 Timely Information
Students, staff and faculty will be informed in a timely manner of changed requirements, rescheduled academic activities, and procedures that will be in effect at the conclusion of the Labour Disruption.

3 Procedures

3.1 Communication and Dissemination of Information

3.1.1 When a Labour Disruption of 11 or more calendar days occurs, Senate Executive:

3.1.1.1 will convene the Provost’s Advisory Committee on the Continuity of Academic Operations (Academic Continuity Committee) chaired by the Vice Provost. The Academic Continuity Committee shall oversee the process of directing and implementing the necessary remedial actions. The Academic Continuity Committee shall provide regular updates to Senate Executive;

3.1.1.2 shall ensure that the normal informational channels are alerted, so that Senate Policies and decisions will be reported widely and accurately;

3.1.1.3 shall post an appropriate notice to remind or notify students, staff, faculty, Faculty Boards, Chairs, Directors, and Deans of their respective roles in giving effect to this Senate Policy;

3.1.1.4 consider whether posting a notice regarding the possibility of rescheduling and/or term extension following the conclusion of the Labour Disruption is required;

3.1.1.5 shall request the Registrar use best efforts to inform and update relevant external bodies about the Labour Disruption;

3.1.1.6 shall request University administrators use best efforts to have externally imposed administrative deadlines extended if needed, specifically around the potential unavailability of Registrarial documents;

3.1.1.7 shall request the University Librarian disseminate information about the impact of a Labour Disruption on access to collections and services;

3.1.1.8 will ensure that any adjustments of academic deadlines be announced widely; and

3.1.1.9 will ensure that the University continually monitors and updates its external communications so that all relevant matters academic are clearly communicated.

3.2 Labour Disruptions

3.2.1 Senate Executive will receive reports from the Provost on the impact of the Labour Disruption.

3.2.2 If a Labour Disruption necessitates an extension or modification to the academic term, including the examination schedule, then Senate Executive shall, after consultation with the Academic Continuity Committee, recommend to Senate such changes to the academic term.
3.2.3 If a Labour Disruption continues to a point where no feasible remedy consistent with the principles of Academic Standards and Quality is available, then, Senate Executive shall, after consultation with the Academic Continuity Committee, recommend to Senate that credit not be given for the course(s).

3.2.4 When the Labour Disruption ends, Senate Executive shall declare so, and give direction to the Academic Continuity Committee to give notice to students, staff, faculty, Faculty Boards, Chairs, Directors, and Deans of the procedures then in effect under this policy.

3.3 Petitions and Appeals
Normal petition and appeal procedures shall apply to deal with academic issues arising from a Labour Disruption.
The meeting began at approximately 1:00 pm.

1. Approval of the Agenda
   The agenda for the Senate Executive Committee meeting on June 7, 2019 was approved by consensus, with one small amendment. A late graduation request was added under “Other Business.”

2. Approval of the Minutes: May 21, 2019
   The minutes were approved (A. Maheshwari, J. Tomberlin) as presented.

3. Approval of Senate agenda: June 21, 2019
   The committee recommended that the SCCASP report on the Amnesty motion be added to the agenda under 8-c and that the SAPC report on the IQAP should be added under 8-d. Agenda item 9 was also modified to include 2 items under Community Engagement: a) Carnegie Classification and b) Hub for Good. Under Reports for Information, Senate Committee Reports was changed to Senate Committee Annual Reports. The Senate agenda for June 21, 2019 was approved (A. Chandler, A. Maheshwari) with these changes.

4. Other Business
   The Registrar’s Office submitted a request for late graduation approval for a student whose documentation was approved after the May 31 Senate
meeting. The committee approved the request unanimously (B. Kuzmarov, B. A. Bacon).

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned (B. Kuzmarov, A. Maheshwari) at 1:38 pm.
Senate Executive Committee  
June 4, 2019  
Web-based Meeting  

MINUTES

Participants: Betina Appel Kuzmarov, Benoit-Antoine Bacon, Andrea Chandler, Beth Hughes, Anil Maheshwari, Jerry Tomberlin

The Executive Committee members were emailed a memorandum and participated in an e-poll to approve a request from the Registrar’s office and from the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Affairs for late graduation of one graduate student and 32 undergraduate students, whose documentation was approved after the May 31 Senate meeting.

The motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Participants: Betina Appel Kuzmarov, Benoit-Antoine Bacon, Andrea Chandler, Beth Hughes, Anil Maheshwari, Jerry Tomberlin

The Executive Committee members were emailed a memorandum and participated in an e-poll to approve a request from the Registrar’s for late graduation of one undergraduate student whose documentation was approved after the May 31 Senate meeting.

The motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
MEMORANDUM

Date: June 12, 2019

To: Dr. Betina Appel Kuzmarov, Clerk of Senate
Cc: Kathy McKinley, Secretary of Senate

From: Stephen Fai, Director, Carleton Immersive Media Studio and Associate Professor, School of Architecture and Urbanism

Re: Report of the Library Committee of Senate 2017-2018

Members 2017/2018:
Stephen Fai (Chair)
Wayne Jones (University Librarian)
Alicia Ott (Committee Secretary)
Heather MacDonald (Professional Librarian)
Omair Shafiq (Faculty of Engineering and Design)
Siobhain Calkin (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences)
Paul Keen (Faculty of Graduate and Post-doctoral Affairs)
Hilary Becker (Sprott School of Business)
Toby Zeng (Faculty of Science)
Tracey Lauriault (Faculty of Public Affairs)
Hemant Gupta (Graduate Student Member)
Reid Smith (Graduate Student Alternate)

The Senate Library Committee (SLC) met on March 8, 2019. This document is meant to summarize the major accomplishments and challenges that were brought forward to the committee during the 2018 and 2019 academic year.

Terms of Reference

While responsible to Senate alone, to advise and make recommendations, as appropriate, to Senate, to the Librarian, to the President, and to other University bodies on the operation and development of the University Library (the term “University Library” refers to the MacOdrum Library and all branch libraries), and in particular to advise and make recommendations in the following areas:

- The University library budget;
- The development of the University library collection;
- The services offered;
• The operation and development of physical facilities;
• The relations of the University library to other libraries, particularly those in the Ottawa area;
• Other areas that it considers to be of immediate relevance to the University Library.

Composition
One faculty member to serve as Chair
• Five other faculty members,
• Two students,
• The University Librarian or his/her representative,
• One professional librarian, and
• One other member of the library staff

Nomination
The method of selection for the members of the committee should be in the usual form: nominations for the library contingent to be made to the Senate Executive by the University Librarian after consultation, including consultation with the University Library Committee or its successor (CUASA Collective Agreement, Article 11.1 (a) (ii)).

Staffing
Most recent hiring within the Library:
Jennifer Browning, Discover Systems Librarian
Matthew Gertler, Business & Government Information Librarian
Chris Shoniker, Data Support Specialist
Justin Ball, Stacks Services Assistant
Alisdair MacRae, Evening Stacks Services Assistant
Courtney Maika, Stacks Services Assistant
Kiah Russell, Digitization and Processing Assistant

Budget
The Library received a 3% increase to the collections budget which results in $188,000 being added to the base. As for fiscal (one-time) funding for 19/20, we received $75,000 for Scival, a tool used for research analysis and metrics.

Strategic and Annual Planning
We continue to do planning for 19/20. We are in the process of having our departments complete a check-in on the goals set out in their individual planning documents. In November, we sent an email to 5,000 randomly selected students, and one-half of faculty, staff, and contract instructors as part of the 2018 Library User
(Insync) Survey. The main purpose of the survey was to give our community the opportunity to state how well they believe the Library performs in relation to what they think is important. The survey focused on performance and importance specifically related to communication, service delivery, facilities and equipment, information resources, and overall satisfaction.

**Collection Maintenance**

Questions in senate arose from an exceptional maintenance project, a large number of titles in English and Art History needed to be reviewed for possible withdrawal after regular maintenance had not been undertaken for a long time. The Department Head of RSS and the Liaisons for those areas are meeting regularly with those concerned and have made adjustments to the project to address the issues. Gaps in faculty communication have also been identified and are being addressed. Senate Library Committee will review the new Collection Maintenance Policy once it is in complete draft form.

**Building Renovations and Hours**

It was noted that access via the tunnel will provide not only the second means of entry into the Library, but will be a boon to those with mobility issues. There was an update to Library hours to be more consistent, open more on holiday weekends, and not closed as often during intercession.

**New Library Search Tool**

University Librarian, Wayne Jones, is currently scheduling visits to Chairs and Directors for a presentation for Departmental Library Reps and Grad students, individual faculty will be made aware through email and news announcements. The library has started the implementation of the new library services platform based on ExLibris Alma and Primo. We initially announced this in June 2018 and have been working since then on preparing for the implementation. New system is scheduled to go live in December 2019. We will continue to update our community as timelines get finalized.