Carleton University Senate
Meeting of April 26, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.
Senate Room, Robertson Hall
AGENDA

Open Session:

1. Approval of Agenda (open)

2. Minutes:
   a. March 29, 2019

3. Matters Arising

4. Chair’s Remarks

5. Question Period

6. Administration (Clerk)
   a. Notification of Appointments made Contrary to Policy
   b. Schedule of Senate meetings for 2019/20 and 2020/21 – finalization
   c. Membership Report: Faculty and student vacancies on Senate
   d. Call for Final Reports from Committee Chairs
   e. Senate Survey – call for participation
   f. Report from Senate Committee Review Task Force

7. Reports:
   a. SAPC (Tomberlin)
   b. SCCASP (H. Nemiroff)

8. Budget Presentation
9. Presentation: Experiential Learning

10. Reports for Information:
    a. Senate Executive Minutes - February 5, 2019

11. Other Business

12. Adjournment
Carleton University Senate
Meeting of March 29, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.
Senate Room, Robertson Hall

MINUTES – OPEN SESSION


Regrets: C. Cruickshank, J. Deaville, M. Esponda, K. Evans, D. Howe, J. Ramasubramanyam, L. Schweitzer, P. Watzlawik-Li


Open Session:

1. Welcome & Approval of Agenda (open)

The Chair began the Open Session of the meeting asking for a moment of silence in memoriam of four members of the Carleton Community (Sylvain Pitre (ITS), Flavia Renon (Library), Pius Adesanmi (Institute of African Studies) and Peter DeMarsh (alumnus)), and of the victims of the anti-Muslim attack in New Zealand.
The Chair then welcomed four new undergraduate students to Senate: Taylor Amt (FPA), Millie Close (Science), Brendan O’Malley (FED) and Bashar Hnidi (FPA). These students were elected recently to fill vacancies on Senate for the remainder of the 2018/19 academic year.

The Chair noted that the CUISIC consultation (Item #8 on the agenda) will be postponed to a later meeting, due to the illness of one of the co-chairs. He asked that this item be struck from the agenda.

It was MOVED (W. Jones, J. Paulson) that Senate approve the open agenda for the meeting of Senate on March 29, 2019, with this modification. The motion PASSED.

2. Minutes: February 15, 2019

It was MOVED (D. Dragunoiu, L. Dyke) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting of February 15, 2019, as presented. The motion PASSED.

3. Matters Arising:

   a. RE: SAPC Major Modification - Change in BA (Hons) Geography Concentration. The committee was asked at the last meeting to check all credit numbers for accuracy and clarity. Vice-Provost Lorraine Dyke indicated that the confusion arose because the table in the executive summary was inadvertently truncated, but she noted that the full data was included in the Calendar entry that was shared with Senators

4. Chair’s Remarks

   • The Chair began by sharing the news that the Collaborate Campaign reached its fundraising goal of $300M. Celebrations took place on March 28 in the University Centre Galleria, and will continue on the evening of April 17, which is the official closing date of the campaign. The Chair acknowledged and thanked his predecessors Alastair Summerlee and Roseann O’Reilly Runte for their contributions and
support. He also recognized the exceptional leadership of Jennifer Conley with her team in University Advancement, and thanked Carleton students, staff and faculty for their commitment to this campaign.

- The Chair highlighted that under the leadership of colleagues in the Institute for African Studies, a Memorial Fund has been launched to honour Professor Pius Adesanmi, who died in a tragic plane crash in Ethiopia last month. The fund will build on his legacy, and every donation made will be matched by the university.

- The Chair announced that under the leadership of the Provost, three decanal searches have now been completed. Dana Brown, former Dean at de Montfort University in the UK and the Director of the MBA program at Oxford University, will be the new Dean for the Sprott School of Business. Larry Kostyuk will be the new Dean of Engineering and Design. Professor Kostyuk served for a decade as the Chair of the Mechanical Engineering Department at the University of Alberta, and also as the AVP Research, leading Alberta’s 75 million CFREF project on Energy. Finally, Carleton’s own Patrice Smith has been appointed as Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs. Professor Smith currently is a Senator, a Professor in Neuroscience and an Associate Dean in Science. The Chair thanked the outgoing Deans and Interim Deans for their service in these roles, noting that there will be many more opportunities to honor their contributions.

- Carleton has recently announced the signing of a new collective agreement with the post-doctoral fellows union. The Chair congratulated both negotiating teams.

- The Chair extended congratulations also to Sarah Todd from the School of Social Work, for winning a prestigious 3M National Teaching Fellowship, recognizing her exceptional contributions to teaching and learning.

- The Chair noted that two Carleton sports teams are national champions this year. The Carleton Men’s Basketball team became the national champions for the 14th time, and the Carleton Men’s Curling team also won their national championship. The Chair extended congratulations to both teams and their coaches.
Over the past two years Carleton has undertaken a number of initiatives in experiential learning. The Vice-Provost will provide an update on this topic at next month’s Senate. In a closely related topic, Carleton is one of 16 post-secondary institutions chosen to participate in a Canadian pilot of the Carnegie classification on community engagement. The Vice-Provost will provide more details next month.

5. Question Period

No questions were submitted in advance.

6. Administration (Clerk)

a. Student Senators Membership Ratification:

The Clerk reported on the election for student Senator positions for 2019/20 which was held this week. 6 of the 10 elected positions for 2019/20 have been filled:

- Science (1): Millie Close (acclamation)
- FASS (2): Julia Bruno, Zack Kryworuchka (acclamation)
- FPA (3): Afreen Ahmad, Tyler Boswell, Sheldon Parathundyil (election – March 27 – 28)

It was MOVED (B. Kuzmarov, S. Blanchard) that Senate ratify the new student Senate appointments for 2019/20, as presented. The motion PASSED.

The Senate Office will circulate another Call in April to fill the remaining 4 student positions. The Clerk reminded Senators to look for emails from the Assistant University Secretary in the coming weeks regarding anticipated faculty vacancies on Senate.

b. Notification of Appointments made Contrary to Policy

The Clerk received notice of 3 instances of non-advertised recruitment. One was a Banting appointment in FPA, and two were
transfers from Term to Instructor in FASS. These are presented to Senate for information only.

c. **Schedule of Senate meetings for 2019/20 and 2020/21**

Draft schedules for Senate meetings in 2019/20 and 2020/21 were circulated to Senate for review and discussion. Senators were asked for feedback on the meeting date for October 2019 which might be rescheduled for the Friday of Reading Week. Reactions to this idea were mixed; the Clerk will consider options and present a final version for approval at the April Senate meeting.

d. **Update on Senate Committee Review - Preliminary Report & Next Steps**

A draft report on the progress of the Senate Committee Review was circulated with the Senate meeting materials. The analysis suggests that there is scope to move forward with the next stage of the review. However, the Clerk noted that in undertaking historical research of Carleton Senate committees, a contradiction in governance roles was discovered between the Senate Executive committee and the Senate Academic Governance Committee. As a result, it is not clear which committee should proceed with the next stage of the review.

The Clerk noted that both committees are aware of this conflict and both support the creation of an ad hoc committee of Senators to resolve the governance conflict and possibly also to complete the Senate review.

The Clerk asked for support from Senators for the creation of this ad hoc committee, and suggested that the composition would be similar to the Free Speech Task Force created by Senate last fall: 3 faculty Senators, 1 Contract Instructor and 2 Student Senators. The ad hoc committee would pick up on the work already completed and make recommendations for a revised committee structure. Calls for Expressions of Interest could go out immediately, and the committee could be ready to meet within the next two weeks with
the goal of making recommendations to bring to the next Senate meeting.

The Clerk presented the following motion:

It was moved (B. Kuzmarov, P. Smith) that Senate approve the creation of an ad-hoc committee of Senators to complete a review of Senate’s Standing Committees and make recommendations to Senate as a result thereof.

Discussion:
Senators discussed the motion and debated which body should be given the mandate to undertake the next part of the review. Most Senators agreed that the Senate Academic Governance Committee and Senate Executive Committee could not be exempt from the review, since their governance mandates need to be clarified. The Clerk explained that Senate committees exist with delegated authority from Senate, which is why Senate, through an ad hoc committee, could move forward with the review and resolve the governance dilemma.

A point of order was raised regarding the motion presented by the Clerk, since there was no notice of motion or memo circulated in advance to Senators. The Assistant University Secretary confirmed that a memo including this motion was not included in the meeting materials.

The Assistant University Secretary added that the notice of motion could be waived if Senate agrees that the action in the motion cannot be delayed until the next Senate meeting. The Chair considered that there is a state of urgency in this matter, since failure to move forward this month with the review would make it impossible to approve any changes in time to implement them for the beginning of the next academic year on July 1st.

It was moved (B. Kuzmarov, L. Dyke) that Senate waive the notice of motion requirement for the motion presented by the Clerk to create an ad hoc committee to complete the Senate Committee review. The motion passed, with a 2/3 majority; 41 in favour and 4 opposed.

MINUTES – MARCH 29, 2019 - OPEN SESSION

6
J. Paulson suggested an amendment to the original motion:

It was **MOVED** (J. Paulson, S. Klausen) the Senate amend the previous motion by substituting for the following motion:

That Senate approve the creation of an ad-hoc committee comprised of the members of the Senate Academic Governance Committee plus 3 Senators to complete a review of Senate’s Standing Committees and make recommendations to Senate as a result thereof.

**Discussion:**
Several Senators felt that members of the Academic Governance Committee should be included because of their expertise in governance, however the Clerk reiterated that placing the review in the hands of the Governance Committee does not resolve the governance conflict that led us here in the first place.

The Chair suggested an amendment by substitution, so that the ad-hoc committee membership would include 4 members of the Governance Committee and 4 Senators:

J. Paulson withdrew his amendment. Senate voted on the following amended motion:

It was **MOVED** (J. Paulson, B. Creary) that Senate approve the creation of an ad-hoc committee comprised of 4 members of the Senate Academic Governance Committee plus 4 elected members of Senate to complete a review of Senate’s Standing Committees and make recommendations to Senate as a result thereof. The motion **PASSED**.

Senators and members of the Governance Committee will be contacted within the next 24 hours with information on the setup of the Task Force, including nomination and election procedures and preferred meeting schedules.
7. Reports:
   
   a. Senate Academic Program Committee (J. Tomberlin)

   Cyclical Program Reviews

   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 Communication Studies. 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 Mathematics and Statistics. 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 undergraduate and graduate programs in Political Science. The motion passed.

   Major Modifications – 2019/20 Calendar Curriculum Proposals

   Individual Motions:

   It was moved that Senate approve the major modification to the PhD in International Affairs program as presented with effect from Fall 2019.

   It was moved that Senate approve the introduction of the Minor in Heritage Conservation as presented with effect from Fall 2019.

   It was moved that Senate approve the major modification to the Bachelor of Engineering, Architectural Conservation and Sustainability Engineering program as presented with effect from Fall 2019.
Reports: a) SAPC (cont’d)

It was MOVED that Senate approve the introduction of ALDS 4307 as presented with effect from Fall 2019.

OMNIBUS MOTION:
It was MOVED (J. Tomberlin, D. Siddiqi) that Senate approve the major modifications as presented above with effect from Fall 2019. The motion PASSED.

Discussion:
A Senator noted that the credits listed for the first-year courses in the proposed Architectural Conservation & Sustainability Engineering program (page 47 of the SAPC documentation binder) do not add up. The Vice-Provost responded that this discrepancy is a function of the software. Unfortunately, courses need to be approved before the credits will show up in this list.

Undergraduate Major Modifications – 2018/19 Calendar Curriculum Proposals

INDIVIDUAL MOTIONS:

It was MOVED that Senate approve the major modification to the BA in Open Studies program as presented with effect from Fall 2018.

It was MOVED that Senate approve the major modification to the BSc in Open Studies program as presented with effect from Fall 2018.

OMNIBUS MOTION:

It was MOVED (J. Tomberlin, A. Plourde) that Senate approve the major modifications as presented above with effect from Fall 2018. The motion PASSED.
b. Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admissions and Studies Policy (SCCASP)

The Chair of SCCASP, Howard Nemiroff presented 8 proposed academic regulation changes for approval and 6 items for information.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, E. Sloan) that Senate approve the changes to Regulation 22 Application for Admission Deadline for the 2019/20 Grad calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, A. Plourde) that Senate approve the regulation changes to the BGINS stream in Global Development for the 2019/20 Grad calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, A. Plourde) that Senate approve regulation changes to the BGINS specialization in Global Development for the 2019/20 Grad calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, P. Smith) that Senate approve regulation changes to the BSc Earth Science and Geography Concentration in Terrain Science for the 2019/20 calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, S. Blanchard) that Senate approve the changes to Reg. 5.3.2 in the 2019/20 calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, P. Rankin) that Senate approve the changes to Coop requirements for BA/BSci Geography for the 2019/20 calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.
Regulation changes to R-UG-B.Eng Year Status for Engineering – adding minimum grade requirements for entry into 2nd year Engineering courses

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, D. Dragunoiu) that Senate approve the changes to R-UG-B.Eng for the 2019/20 calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

Senate Policy on Accommodation for Student Activities

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, D. Dragunoiu) that Senate approve the revisions to the Senate Policy on Accommodations for Student Activities as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

8. **Carleton University Indigenous Strategic Initiatives Committee Consultation**  
This item was removed from the agenda.

9. **Reports for Information:**
   a. Academic Colleague (Jeff Smith)
      Jeff Smith presented a brief summary of his report to Senate. The COU meeting scheduled for February 13 did not happen, but the report included high-level notes COU would have used to frame the discussion at the meeting. The next meeting will be in April at Queen’s University. 
      There were no questions.

   b. Senate Executive Committee Minutes (February 5, 2019)
      There were no questions.

10. **Other Business**  
    There was none.

11. **Adjournment**  
    It was **MOVED** (J. Tomberlin, J. Paulson) that the Senate meeting be adjourned. The motion **PASSED**.  
    The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 pm.
Question Period Submissions
Carleton University Senate: Meeting of April 26, 2019

GSA Questions (Jay Ramasubranyam)

1. Given the provincial government's Student Choice Initiative (SCI), the university is certainly in a tight spot. Nevertheless, institutions like Carleton also have leeway in deciding how to apply the SCI. Does the university plan on making some of the levies that are meant to support students directly mandatory?

2. To what extent is the senior administration willing to hear out the voices of groups that rely entirely on levies to ensure that a stronger student community is built on campus, which is in the best interests of the university's smooth functioning?

Questions from J. Paulson

1. In the election for Senators to join the Senate Committee Review committee, the Clerk’s office told Senators—incorrectly—that Senate had “agreed” about the task force membership (one student, one contract instructor, and “two elected faculty members, preferably with experience serving on one or more Senate Standing Committees”). Although the actual motion passed by Senate was, upon request, subsequently sent to Senators, no context was given and no retraction of the tendentious prior statement of preferred qualifications was made, despite a retraction being requested. Instead, the Clerk’s own preferences were allowed to stand in for the will of Senate. Will the Clerk apologize for this, and assure us that future statements of this kind will be made with greater clarity and transparency?

2. At President Summerlee’s first Senate meeting, he revealed that Senate had, under the previous administration, been wrongly cut out of the SMA preparation (indeed the most recent SMA had never been shown to Senate until the beginning of the terms of President Summerlee and Provost Tomberlin), and promised Senators that this would not happen in the future — that Senate would be transparently involved in the process of creating the next SMA from the outset. Now that our SMAs are being tossed out and restructured by the province, what does the
University know about the coming metrics, and what role will Senate play in developing the revised SMA (and related metrics)?

On metrics, specifically: some Senators have of course, in previous debates, expressed concern about their use. (A reminder of some of these points: for many purposes, and in some disciplines, it is (to put it mildly) very difficult to employ them to any good effect\footnote{common, one-size-fits-all metrics will incentivize short-term, easy, and repetitive research; grade inflation; multiple choice exams over writing development; and short-term student outcomes. In my discipline, for instance, I’m less interested in whether my student has a job after graduation than what kind of a person they are in 10 years; it’s the letters that come back after that point that tell me whether I’ve done my job well.) Obviously these would degrade the academic mission of the university and would thus be of grave concern to Senate. Does the administration already have an existing, unalterable position on metrics, or will its approach to the metrics mandate be approached with the same care and caution as, say, the free speech policy, with Senate being fully and transparently involved?

3. What is the purpose of the ‘Expert Panel’ developing an action plan for intellectual property? Intellectual property is, of course, covered by collective agreements; what kind of ‘action’ is being proposed? Will Senate or any committees of Senate have a role to play?

\footnote{There is plenty of scholarly research on this; the most recent is probably the economic historian Jerry Muller’s \textit{The Tyranny of Metrics} (Princeton, 2018).}
MEMORANDUM

From: Clerk of Senate
To: Senate
Date: April 16, 2019
Subject: Marshal of Convocation Duties – June 13, 2019

According to the Academic Governance of the University, the Clerk of Senate may, with the approval of Senate, designate a full-time tenured faculty member to act as Marshal of Convocation (AGU Article 6, Section 2).

For June 2019 Convocation, the Clerk requests that Senate approve this designation for one day of Convocation only (Thursday June 13, 2019).

Motion: That Senate approve the designation of Professor Donald Russell as Marshal of Convocation for Ceremonies 6 and 7 on Thursday June 13, 2019.
MEMORANDUM
From the Senate Committee Review Task Force

From:   Clerk of Senate
To:  Senate
Date:  April 18, 2019
Subject: Senate Committee Review – Recommendations

Introduction:
Under the direction of the Clerk of Senate, the Senate Office began a review of Senate committees in December 2018. The first stage of this review was a benchmarking study of Ontario University Senates to understand the broad landscape of Senate committee structure at similar institutions. This was completed in January 2019 and reported to Senate at the meeting on January 25, 2019. The second stage included a review of the current state of Carleton Senate committees. The Clerk of Senate surveyed by email all committee Chairs to obtain feedback on the current structure and function of their committees and to provide some institutional memory for each committee. The third stage involved an archival review of Senate committees. The next stage of the process would have involved working with the Senate Academic Governance Committee to review individual committee terms of reference and consequently the structural review. However, the archival review revealed a governance anomaly between the Senate Executive Committee and the Senate Academic Governance Committee. As a result of this anomaly it was unclear which committee was empowered to oversee Senate Standing Committees and as a result move this review forward. Consequently, a proposal was brought to Senate on March 29 to form a Task Force to both resolve this anomaly and to complete the review. This Task Force, composed of 4 Senators (2 faculty, 1 contract instructor and 1 student) and 4 members of the Senate Academic Governance Committee plus the Clerk of Senate as Chair, has met four times (April 4, April 9, April 15, April 18) to discuss current committee structural issues including the governance anomaly outlined above. This memo outlines five recommendations of the Task Force in motion form.

Motions for Senate Approval:
Governance Mandate Issues: Senate Executive Committee & Senate Academic Governance Committee

1. The Task Force recommends that responsibility for Senate committee oversight, listed in the first half of item #2 of the Senate Executive Committee’s Terms of Reference (attached), be transferred to the Senate Academic Governance Committee.

Motion: That Senate approve the transfer of the responsibility of Senate committee oversight, listed in the Senate Executive Committee’s Terms of Reference as “Recommend[ing] to the Senate the number, size and terms of reference of standing committees of the Senate,” to the Senate Academic Governance Committee.
2. The Task Force also recommends that coordinating the work of Senate committees, listed in the second half of item #2 of the Terms of Reference of the Senate Executive Committee, be the responsibility of the Clerk and the office of the Secretariat, as is current practice.

Motion: That Senate approve the transfer of the responsibility for “coordinating the work of Senate committees”, listed in the Senate Executive Committee’s Terms of Reference (Item 2), to the Clerk and office of the Secretariat.

3. The Task Force recommends that the Senate Academic Governance Committee assumes responsibility for overseeing committee membership. The Governance Committee’s role would be to oversee a nomination and election process which would then conclude with ratification of new committee members by Senate. The administrative work of the election process would be undertaken by the University Secretariat, which conforms to current practice.

Motion: That Senate approve the transfer of the responsibility for oversight of the nomination and election process for Senate committee membership from the Senate Executive Committee to the Senate Academic Governance Committee.

Revised membership of the Senate Academic Governance Committee

4. The Task Force recommends revising the composition of the Senate Academic Governance Committee to include more Senate representation on the committee, in light of the fact that this committee now has authority to oversee Senate standing committees. Consequently, the Task Force also recommends a less strict requirement for individual line-faculty representation on the committee.

Motion: That Senate approve the revised composition of the Senate Academic Governance Committee, such that the 6 faculty members on the committee be broadly representative of the line-faculties of the university and that at least 50% of the faculty membership on the committee be composed of current or past sitting Senators.

Consolidation of Senate Appeals Committees

5. The Task Force recommends consolidating four Senate appeals committees into one Senate Appeals Board, with individual specific appeal bodies as subcommittees. The Appeals Board as the reporting body to Senate would be composed of the Chairs of the subcommittees. Subcommittees would be constituted as required to carry out the work of appeals.

Motion: That Senate approve the consolidation of the Senate Academic Integrity Appeals Committee, the Senate Graduate Students Appeal Committee, the Senate Academic Accommodation Appeals Committee, and the Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee into the Senate Appeals Board.
Revised Committee Terms of Reference and Composition

Senate Executive Committee

Responsibilities

The Senate Executive Committee’s duties are to:

1. Arrange the agenda and plan the forthcoming business of Senate;

2. Recommend to the Senate the number, size and terms of reference of standing committees of the Senate and to co-ordinate the work of Senate committees;

3-2. Nominate the Clerk of Senate for appointment by the Senate;

4. Nominate the members of standing committees of Senate, Senate representatives and members of joint committees unless otherwise determined by Senate;

5-3. Approve new and revised scholarships and bursaries;

6-4. To act, on behalf of Senate, in approving honorary degree recipients in special-case situations.

7-5. Make decisions on such matters as the Senate may delegate to it;

8-6. Approve the Academic Schedules;

9-7. Recommend Special Appointments to Senate.

In addition, Senate annually, at the last regular meeting of the academic year, empowers the Executive to act for Senate on urgent items of regular business during the months of July and August. Notice of any meetings of the Executive held under this authority (except those called for the purposes of the Executive dealing with its own regular business) shall be given to all members of Senate who may attend and vote. Any actions under this authority are reported to Senate at its next meeting.

Senate Academic Governance Committee

Terms of Reference

To consider matters related to the academic governance of the University, and in particular, in regard to academic governance:

1. To advise Senate on the interpretation of existing Senate provisions;

2. To receive and make recommendations to Senate on any proposals to introduce changes;

3. To provide a continuing review, and on this basis, to make recommendations to Senate on possible changes thereto.
4. To recommend to the Senate the number, size and terms of reference of standing committees of the Senate

3-5. To oversee the nomination and election process for Senate committee membership.

Composition

1. The Clerk of Senate, *ex-officio*

2. Six faculty members with one from each faculty (including Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs), broadly representative of the faculties of the university, with at least 50% being current or past sitting Senators.

3. One undergraduate student

4. One graduate student
DATE: April 26, 2019

TO: Senate

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

RE: Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary: MA Program in Economics

The purpose of this memorandum is to request that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the cyclical review of the MA program in Economics.

The request to Senate is based on a recommendation from the Senate Academic Program Committee (SAPC), which passed the following motion at its meeting of April 18, 2019:

THAT SAPC recommends to SENATE the approval of the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the cyclical program review of the MA program in Economics.

The Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary is provided pursuant to articles 4.2.5-4.2.6 of the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and article 7.2.23 of Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). Article 7.2.23.3 of Carleton’s IQAP (passed by Senate on June 26th, 2015 and ratified by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance on September 25th, 2015) stipulates that, in approving Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries ‘the role of SAPC and Senate is to ensure that due process has been followed and that the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary are reasonable in terms of the documentation on which they are based.’

In making their recommendation to Senate and fulfilling their responsibilities under the IQAP, members of SAPC were provided with all the appendices listed on page 2 of the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary. These appendices constitute the basis for reviewing the process that was followed and assessing the appropriateness of the outcomes.

These appendices are not therefore included with the documentation for Senate. They can, however, be made available to Senators should they so wish.

Major modifications described in the Action Plan, contained within the Final Assessment Report, are subject to approval by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance, the Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admission, and Studies Policy, the Senate Academic Program Committee (SAPC) and Senate as outlined in articles 7.5.1 and 5.1 of Carleton’s IQAP.

Once approved by Senate, the Final Assessment Report, Executive Summary and Action Plan will be forwarded to the Ontario Universities’ Council on Quality Assurance and to Carleton’s Board of Governors for information. The Executive Summary and Action Plan will be posted on the website of Carleton University's Office of the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), as required by the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's IQAP.
Senate Motion April 26, 2019

THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the MA program in Economics.
DATE: April 26, 2019

TO: Senate

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

RE: 2020-21 Calendar Curriculum Proposals

Undergraduate Major Modifications

Background
Following Faculty Board approval and, as part of academic quality assurance, major curriculum modifications are considered by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA), the Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admissions and Studies Policy (SCCASP) and the Senate Academic Program Committee (SAPC) before being recommended to Senate.

Library Reports (as required)
In electronic communication dated April 8, 2019 the Science Librarian, upon review of the proposal, confirmed no additional resources were required for the 2020-21 major modification included below.

Documentation
Recommended calendar language, along with supplemental documentation as appropriate, are provided for consideration and approval.

Major Modifications

1. B.Sc. in Chemistry, Concentration in Chemical Toxicology
   CUCQA approval: April 10, 2019
   SCCASP approval: April 16, 2019

SAPC Motion April 18, 2019
THAT SAPC recommends to Senate the approval of the introduction of the Concentration in Chemical Toxicology to the B.Sc. in Chemistry program as presented with effect from Fall 2020.

Senate Motion April 26, 2019
   THAT Senate approve the introduction of the Concentration in Chemical Toxicology to the B.Sc. in Chemistry program as presented with effect from Fall 2020.
MEMORANDUM
From the Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admission and Studies Policy

To: Senate
From: Howard Nemiroff, Chair of SCCASP
Date: April 26, 2019
Subject: 2019-20 Academic Regulations Changes

For Senate approval:

1. Revisions to Reg 7.5 Bachelor of Architectural Studies

   Motion: That Senate approve the changes to Reg 7.5 for the 2019/20 Undergrad calendar as presented

   • Attachment(s): R-UG-7.5 B.A.S

For Information to Senate

1. GR General Regulation 14 –Cooperative Education policy – clarification of policy for grad students
   Attachment: TBD-1804 R-GR-14 Coop Policy

2. Editorial Change to BENG-951A and BENG-951B – removal of SREE 1000
   Attachments: BENG-951A; BENG-951B

3. Reg 6.8 Simultaneous and Subsequent Degree – Addition of B.HSc and Open Studies
   Attachment: TBD 1331 R-UG-6.8
Program Change Request

Date Submitted: 03/21/19 9:54 am

Viewing: **R-UG-7.5 B.A.S. : R-UG-7.5 Bachelor of Architectural Studies**

Last approved: 04/04/17 2:44 pm

Last edit: 03/21/19 9:54 am

Last modified by: mikelabreque

Changes proposed by: mikelabreque

In Workflow

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

Approval Path

1. 03/27/19 9:38 am
   Dotty Nwakanma (dottynwakanma):
   Approved for REGS RO UG Review
2. 03/27/19 10:11 am
   Mike Labreque (mikelabreque):
   Approved for PRE SCCASP

History

1. Nov 12, 2014 by Dan Begin (danbegin)
2. Nov 12, 2014 by Dan Begin (danbegin)
3. Oct 7, 2015 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
5. Feb 29, 2016 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
6. May 31, 2016 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
7. May 31, 2016 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
8. Apr 4, 2017 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)
9. Apr 4, 2017 by Sandra Bauer (sandrabauer)

Calendar Pages Using this Program

Architectural Studies
Bachelor of Architectural Studies
Academic Performance Evaluation

https://nextcalendar.carleton.ca/courseleaf/approve/?role=admin
Program Requirements

Bachelor of Architectural Studies

B.A.S. Conservation and Sustainability, B.A.S. Urbanism

These programs follow the academic performance evaluation regulations governing Honours programs as described within sections 7.1 - 7.4 of the Academic Regulations of the University.

B.A.S. Design

The B.A.S. Design follows the academic performance evaluation regulations for Engineering and Design programs as described in section 7.0 of the Academic Regulations of the University.

B.A.S. (All)

The following additions and amendments apply to all B.A.S. programs:

1. Students are assessed at each Academic Performance Evaluation using the Core minimum as described below.
2. Good Standing requires a minimum grade of C- in each Design Core course.
3. The Design Core consists of the following courses:

B.A.S. Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 1005</td>
<td>[0.5]</td>
<td>Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 1105</td>
<td>[1.0]</td>
<td>Studio 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 2105</td>
<td>[1.5]</td>
<td>Studio 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 2106</td>
<td>[1.5]</td>
<td>Studio 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 3105</td>
<td>[1.5]</td>
<td>Studio 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 3107</td>
<td>[1.0]</td>
<td>Studio 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 4105</td>
<td>[1.5]</td>
<td>Studio 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 4107</td>
<td>[1.0]</td>
<td>Studio 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.A.S. Urbanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 1005</td>
<td>[0.5]</td>
<td>Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 1105</td>
<td>[1.0]</td>
<td>Studio 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS 3501</td>
<td>[0.5]</td>
<td>Course ARCS 3501 Not Found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ARCU 2303 [1.0]**  
**Fundamentals of Urbanism**

**ARCU 3303 [1.0]**  
Urbanism Studio 1: Urbanism in the Core

**ARCU 3304 [1.0]**  
Urbanism Studio 2: Urbanism on the Periphery

**ARCU 4304 [1.0]**  
Urbanism Studio 4: Global Perspectives

**ARCU 4304 [1.0]**  
Urbanism Studio 4: Global Perspectives

B.A.S. Conservation and Sustainability

**ARCS 1005 [0.5]**  
Drawing

**ARCS 1105 [1.0]**  
Studio 1

**ARCC 3501 [0.5]**  
Fundamentals of Conservation and Sustainability

**ARCC 3301 [1.0]**  
Conservation Studio 1: Historical Analysis and Adaptive Re-use

**ARCC 3302 [1.0]**  
Conservation Studio 2

**ARCC 4301 [1.5]**  
Conservation Studio 3

4. B.A.S. students continue either in Good Standing or on Academic Warning.

5. Students whose academic performance evaluation results in Suspension must leave the B.A.S. degree. Application for readmission to all B.A.S. programs may be made after one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Resources</th>
<th>No New Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>BAS-Urbanism has deleted a 0.5 credit core course (ARCU 3501) and replaced it with a new 1.0 credit course (ARCU 2303). The School has confirmed that the new course should be added to the Urbanism core and assessed at APE. This is a collateral modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for change</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition/Implementation</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program reviewer comments

---

Key: 1111
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DATE: April 26, 2019

TO: Senate

FROM: Dr. Lorraine Dyke, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic),
Chair, Experiential Learning Steering Committee

RE: New Proposed Degree Level Expectation on Experiential Learning

Background
In support of enhancing experiential learning across campus, the Experiential Learning Steering Committee proposed a new Degree Level Expectation (DLE) on Experiential Learning. The six existing provincial DLE’s are used in program reviews to ensure that curriculum is mapped to those expectations. The purpose of the proposed Carleton DLE on experiential learning is to: (1) signal Carleton’s commitment to experiential learning, and (2) to ensure that all programs include experiential learning in their learning outcomes and curriculum maps. This will allow us to identify EL opportunities more systematically and will better position the university to meet the provincial requirements.

Following the initial development of the DLE, a round of cross-campus consultations was undertaken by the committee Chair which included:
- FASS Faculty Board – February 4, 2019
- FED Chairs and Directors – September 12, 2018
- FPA Chairs and Directors – December 3, 2018
- Graduate Faculty Board – November 21, 2018 and January 23, 2018
- Science Faculty Board – November 29, 2018
- Sprott Management Committee – November 19, 2018

On March 14, 2019, the Experiential Learning Committee met and revised the DLE based on the feedback from these consultations. The Committee recommends the adoption of the following Degree Level Expectation on Experiential Learning:

"Reflect on the link between theoretical knowledge and experiential application in contexts that prepare students for the workplace and civil society."

A document is attached outlining the current provincial DLEs, the proposed experiential learning expectations by degree level and sample learning outcomes that could map to the proposed DLE on experiential learning.

Motion:
That SENATE approve the proposed Degree Level Expectation as presented with effect from Fall 2019.
Proposed Carleton Degree Level Expectation on Experiential Learning

**Provincial Degree Level Expectations (DLEs)**
DLEs “serve as Ontario universities’ academic standards and identify the knowledge and skill outcome competencies that reflect progressive levels of intellectual and creative development” (Ontario Universities Quality Assurance Framework, 2016). Current DLEs include:

1. Depth and breadth of knowledge
2. Knowledge of methodologies (undergraduate) or research and scholarship (graduate)
3. Application of knowledge
4. Autonomy and professional capacity
5. Communications skills
6. Awareness of limits of knowledge

**Purpose of the Proposed DLE**
The purpose of the proposed DLE on experiential learning is to: (1) signal Carleton’s commitment to experiential learning, and (2) to ensure that all programs include experiential learning in their learning outcomes and curriculum maps. This will allow us to identify EL opportunities more systematically and will better position the university to meet the provincial requirements.

**Proposed Carleton DLE on Experiential Learning:**
Reflect on the link between theoretical knowledge and experiential application in contexts that prepare students for the workplace and civil society.

**Proposed Experiential Learning Expectations by Degree Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baccalaureate/Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Baccalaureate/Bachelor’s Degree: Honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) the ability to identify the links between experiential activity and concepts and how these may relate to individual’s interests. &lt;br&gt;b) the ability to provide a description of own performances on tasks with a focus on general strengths and weaknesses. &lt;br&gt;c) the ability to present knowledge and information in an appropriate format. &lt;br&gt;d) the ability to use knowledge, skills, theoretical concepts and methodology in new situations.</td>
<td>a) the ability to make comparisons between experiential activity and academic concepts that indicate understanding of similarities and differences and the points of view of others. &lt;br&gt;b) the ability to articulate own strengths and weaknesses in performing tasks and to use self-awareness to address challenges in other contexts. &lt;br&gt;c) the ability to present knowledge, skills, and information in formats that illustrate the connection between content and method in a basic way. &lt;br&gt;d) the ability to use knowledge, skills, theoretical concepts and methodologies in order to explain and solve problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019/04/17
**MASTER’S DEGREE**

a) effective use of experiential learning to explain and critique concepts and theories in the area of study.
b) the ability to reflect and self-evaluate to demonstrate learning growth and development.
c) the ability to communicate knowledge, skills and information in various formats effective for a targeted audience and to make explicit connections between what is communicated (content) and methods of communications.
d) the ability to make adaptations and apply knowledge, skills, theoretical concepts and methodologies to new experiences and to solve problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sample Learning Outcomes Relevant to the Proposed DLE on Experiential Learning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to articulate real world knowledge and skills gained beyond the classroom including in field research with industry and community groups, internships, and international opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows and follows proper procedures and regulations for safe handling and use of chemicals and prescribed safety procedures and regulations in the laboratory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates will demonstrate strategic thinking appropriate to political workplaces in government, the private sector and/or the voluntary sector in Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an interest to seek out international and inter-cultural opportunities concerning Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have demonstrated knowledge of leadership capacity, developed through exposure to or participation in a variety of formats such as leading class discussions, developing activism projects, and engagement in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate application of management principles in an experiential setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOCTORAL DEGREE**

a) the ability to independently synthesize information, or draw conclusions by combining examples, facts, theories from multiple EL experiences.
b) the ability to self-evaluate learning progress and to identify and address concerns and challenges in diverse contexts.
c) the ability to communicate knowledge, skills and information in an integrative way that contributes to the enhancement of meaning for both academic and non-academic audiences.
d) the ability to make adaptations and apply knowledge, skills, theories and methodologies to new experiences and to solve problems with originality and novelty.
Canadian Pilot of the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

Initial Convening February 2019
Attended by Lorraine Dyke, Karen Schwartz, Katherine Graham
An elective certification
- Recognizes a university’s deep and pervasive commitment to its community
- Leading framework for institutional assessment of CE in US higher education for the past 13 years
- Involves review of institutional mission, identity and commitments
- Currently 361 campuses with the Community Engagement Classification in the US
Institutional self-assessment and self-study
- A way to bring the disparate parts of the campus together in a way that advances a unified agenda.
- It allows for the identification of promising practices that can be shared across the institution.

Legitimacy
- Seeking a new level of legitimacy, public recognition and visibility for the work.

Accountability
- A way to demonstrate that the institution is fulfilling its mission to serve the public good.

Catalyst for Change
- A tool for fostering institutional alignment for community-based teaching, learning and scholarship.

Institutional Identity
- The classification is a way to clarify institutional identity and mission that distinguishes the institution from peers.
1. Respect the diversity of institutions and their approach to community engagement;
2. Engage institutions in a process of inquiry, reflection, and self-assessment; and
3. Honor institutions’ achievements while promoting ongoing development of their programs

Driscoll, Carnegie’s Community Engagement Classification: Intentions and Insights, Change, 2008
Carnegie is expanding the classification internationally including Australia, Canada and Ireland

Purpose of the pilot is to tailor the classification to the Canadian context (e.g. reconciliation)

Following a national call, Carleton was selected as one of 16 participating Canadian institutions

If successful in first round of Canadian certification, Carleton will be known as a Founding Member of the Canadian Carnegie Classification
Participating Universities
The focus of the framework is on:

- The academic and scholarly dimensions of engagement
- The University’s inputs into the engagement process over outcomes
- The corporate record of support of:
  - community engagement, and
  - strong, mutual partnerships

rather than individual activities
I. Campus and Community Context

II. Foundational Indicators
   A. Institutional Identity and Culture
   B. Institutional Assessment
   C. Institutional Communication
   D. Institutional - Community Relations
   E. Infrastructure and Finance
   F. Tracking, Monitoring, and Assessment
   G. Faculty and Staff
III. Categories of Community Engagement

A. Curricular Engagement
   • Teaching and Learning
   • Curriculum

B. Co-Curricular Engagement

C. Professional Activity and Scholarship

D. Community Engagement and Other Institutional Initiatives

IV. Outreach and Partnerships

A. Outreach

B. Partnerships

V. Reflection and Additional Information
Preparation of the Application

- Carleton will be asked to identify 15 key partners
  - Should be broad, trans-disciplinary partnerships

- Identified partners will be surveyed
  - Evaluators will look for mutuality

- Faculties, professional and student service units from across campus will be engaged
  - Through Community Engagement Steering Committee (CESC) and other venues

- Application will be prepared jointly
  - Team: Karen Schwartz, Katherine Graham and Lorraine Dyke
  - With guidance from CESC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2020</td>
<td>Initial Applications Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 2020</td>
<td>Site Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 2020</td>
<td>Evaluation Feedback Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Finalize Canadian Classification Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Governance Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select National Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2022</td>
<td>Final Applications Due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planned Information Sharing Venues

March 18  PAG
March 20  VPARC
March 27  Carleton University Community Connections Event
April 2   Community Engagement Steering Committee
April 18  Student Government Leaders
April 25  Provost’s Café
April 26  Senate
May 23   Academic Heads Roundtable
Fall 2019 Board of Governors Community Relations Comm.
The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:01 am.

1. **Approval of the Agenda**
   The Committee approved by general consensus the Senate Executive Committee agenda for March 19, 2019.

2. **Approval of the Minutes: February 5, 2019**
   The Committee approved by general consensus the minutes of the Senate Executive Committee meeting on February 5, 2019, with one minor correction to the attendance record.

3. **Approval of Senate agenda: March 29, 2019**
   The Senate agenda for March 29 (open and closed sessions) was approved by general consensus with the following notations and changes:
   - SAPC will bring forward motions for 3 cyclical reviews and 6 major modifications, including the proposal for a new BA and BSc open studies degree.
   - The CUISIC (Carleton University Indigenous Strategic Initiatives Committee) consultation planned for the meeting will last between 30 and 45 minutes.
   - Item 6c (Schedule of Senate Meetings) will include dates for both 2019/20 and 2020/21.
4. Review of Senate Minutes: February 15, 2019
Two minor changes were suggested under the Discussion summaries for Items 7(a)i and 7(a)ii (Report of the Senate Academic Program Committee), in the minutes for the Open Session on February 15th. The committee recommended the circulation of these minutes to Senate with these changes.

5. Empowering Motion – Posthumous Degrees/Recognition
The Clerk reported on 3 items that have come to Senate Executive for approval through the Empowering Motion:
- Approval for a posthumous Certificate of Academic Accomplishment for an undergraduate student
- Approval for a posthumous degree (BSW) for a student, and
- Approval for a request for a post-graduation change for a student, which would add a co-operative education designation to the official diploma

It was MOVED (B. Kuzmarov, J. Tomberlin) that Senate Executive approve the requests for posthumous recognition and post-graduation change, as presented. The motion PASSED unanimously.

The approvals will be reported to Senate at the closed session of the next meeting under “Report Under the Empowering Motion.”

6. Report on Senate Committee Review (Clerk)
A draft Report on the Senate Committee Review was circulated to committee members in advance. The Clerk indicated that the review summarizes research undertaken so far in the Senate Office, and will be discussed at Senate on March 29th.

The Clerk noted that while undertaking historical research on the Senate committees, the Senate Office discovered a governance anomaly that needs to be resolved before the review can move forward. In 2008, a motion was brought to Senate requesting changes to the Terms of Reference and membership criteria of the Senate Executive Committee. The changes included transferring the responsibility for committee oversight from the Senate Executive Committee to the Senate Academic Governance Committee. The motion passed at Senate, but does not seem to have been formalized. The Terms of Reference for both committees were unchanged, as was the summary of the Senate Executive Committee in the AGU. To complicate things further, in 2011 the Clerk of Senate felt the first vote on this issue at Senate was not legally binding because it did not
record a 2/3 majority. The motion was brought back to Senate for a re-
vote, but only membership criteria were included in the revote, not the
terms of reference and/or delegation of authority. As a result, it is not clear
who has the mandate to oversee committee restructuring as part of the
current committee review.

The Clerk suggested that a solution to this dilemma would be to create a
Senate ad hoc committee to oversee the final stages of the committee
review and restructuring. The committee would be a neutral “third party”
with the authority of Senate, that could resolve the governance authority
issues of these two committees, as part of a broad and complete review
and restructuring of Senate committees. The Clerk noted that the goal
would be to create this ad-hoc committee quickly so that it would be able
to meet at least twice in early April and report back to Senate at the next
meeting on April 26, with recommendations for changes.

It was MOVED (B. Kuzmarov, B. Hughes) that Senate Executive endorse the
creation of an ad hoc committee of Senate to finalize the Senate
Committee Review.
The motion PASSED unanimously.

The Clerk added that the suggested composition of the ad-hoc committee
would be similar to the Task Force for the Free Speech Policy: 3 faculty
member Senators, 1 Contract Instructor Senator, and 2 Student Senators (1
undergraduate and 1 graduate) plus the Clerk of Senate. If Senate
endorses the creation of this ad-hoc committee, the Senate Office will
circulate an open Call for Expressions of Interest immediately after the
Senate Meeting on March 29, with the goal of confirming membership
before April 4th. An election can be held if required on April 3rd. The
committee agreed by consensus to this plan.

7. Other Business
Members of the committee discussed the Senate meeting schedules for
2019/20 and 2020/21 that were circulated in the meeting package. The
Clerk noted that the Secretariat plans the Board of Governors meeting
schedule two years in advance, and this practice will be adopted for the
Senate as well moving forward, in order to coordinate the two schedules
more effectively.

It was noted that the September 2019 Senate meeting has been scheduled
early to avoid a conflict with the Ontario Universities Fair on September 25
and 26. Similarly, the October 2019 Senate meeting has been scheduled
on October 18 to avoid meeting during Reading Week on October 25. However, the Vice-Provost noted that meeting deadlines for program approvals in time to be able to advertise them would be difficult with such an early October meeting date. It was agreed to bring the question to Senate and to change this date to October 25, if enough Senators would be in attendance during Fall Break.

8. Adjournment

It was MOVED (B. Hughes, J. Tomberlin) that the meeting be adjourned. The motion PASSED.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 am.