



Carleton University acknowledges and respects the Algonquin people, traditional custodian of the land on which the Carleton University campus is situated.

**Carleton University Senate
Meeting of September 26, 2025 at 2:00 pm
PK608**

MINUTES

Present: Z. Al Attar, I. Alma, D. Amundsen, J. Armstrong, M. Bahran, F. Brouard, J. Brunet, J. Brzozowski (acting for S. Blanchard) N. Bruni, S. Burges, A. Butler, B. Creary, R. Dansereau (Clerk), J. Debanne, S. Duncan, M. El Sayed, A. El-Roby, N. Giroux-Laplane, R. Goubran, K. Graham, E. Gray, J. Greenberg, T. Haats, X. Haziza, D. Hornsby, A. Hurrelmann, S. Joe-Ezigbo, I. Knezevic, A. Kocsis, G. Lachance, T. Lewis, B. MacLeod L. Madokoro, G. Maracle, J. Mason, A. Masoumi, D. McNair, D. Mendeloff, R. Miller, M. Mullally, K. Nyediin Buoy, B. O'Neill, Y. Ono, M. Papineau, E. Peirce, P. Rankin, M. Rivers-Moore, M. Rooney, C. Ruiz-Martin, S. Sadaf, A. Shotwell, B. Tackaberry, M. Talebi Dastenaie, N. Tate, W. Tettey (Chair), R. Tfaily, C. Trudel, M. Vatankhah, S. Viel, G. Wainer,

Regrets: A. Bordeleau, A. Bowker, I. Bumagin, J. P. Corriveau, T. Davidson, M. DeRosa, N. Hagigi, K. Hellemans, G. Lacroix, G. Maracle, H. Nemiroff, R. Renfroe, T. Turbat, P. Williams, W. Ye

Absent: S. Hawkins, G. Lacroix, Y. Ono, K. Patel, R. Teather

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

-
1. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm. The Chair welcomed all to the first Senate meeting of the 2025-26 academic year, and extended a special welcome to newly elected student and faculty members, new representatives from the Board of Governors, the new alumni representative and the new Interim Dean of Engineering, Dr. Ronald Miller.

The Chair also offered condolences to friends and colleagues of Dr. Carman Bickerton, a long-serving professor in the History Department, who recently passed away.

Before turning to the agenda, the Chair noted that Senate meetings will continue to be held in person, with a new hybrid option added for meetings from April to June to support student participation beyond the academic term.

It was **MOVED** (F. Brouard, D. Hornsby) that Senate approve the agenda for the meeting of Senate on September 26, 2025, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

2. Minutes: June 6, 2025 (open session)

It was **MOVED** (R. Goubran, S. Burges) that Senate approve the minutes of the Open Session of the Senate meeting on June 6, 2025, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

3. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began his remarks by thanking those Senators who participated in the inaugural Senate Professional Development Workshop on September 12. The event provided an opportunity for Senators to reflect on shared purpose, to speak candidly and to share perspectives on academic governance via discussion groups and reflection activities. The Chair reminded Senators who have not already done so to complete the post-event survey to provide feedback on the workshop and help inform planning for future professional development activities.

The Chair then provided several Ontario post-secondary sector updates.

Over the summer the provincial government introduced Bill 33 (Supporting Children and Students Act) and Bill 46 (an Act to amend various other Acts). Key aspects of these bills include the following:

- Merit-based admissions – a mandate that admissions policies at publicly funded institutions are clear and based on merit
- Mandatory requirement for institutions to implement research security plans
- Potential regulation of student fees

- The legal supremacy of the MCURES Act to prevail over other Acts and regulations.

The Ministry has initiated consultations with university leaders to explore improvements to institutional governance, efficiency, and accountability, and to keep governance structures focused on student success and financial sustainability. Carleton has provided written feedback, and the Council of Ontario Universities has submitted sector-wide recommendations that emphasize institutional autonomy, academic freedom and continued support for governance reviews.

The provincial government also introduced Bill 194, Strengthening Cyber Security and Building Trust in the Public Sector Act. This Act will require universities to:

- Align cybersecurity programs with new provincial standards
- Establish oversight for Artificial Intelligence governance
- Update privacy policies and incident tracking
- Review data practices, particularly for programs involving minors.

Carleton management is actively reviewing the legislation and updating policies to ensure compliance.

Finally, the Chair noted that consultations on the provincial funding formula are progressing slowly. Carleton is advocating for a model that will support long-term financial stability. The Council of Ontario Universities (COU) is also exploring a large-scale public engagement campaign to highlight the value of Ontario's universities.

The Chair next provided an update on enrolment, noting some encouraging trends. Across Ontario, first-year undergraduate applications rose by 5% and at Carleton the applicant pool saw a slight increase of 0.3%, with confirmations growing by 2%. A full fall enrolment update will be provided to Senate in January 2026.

The following highlights in research were then provided to Senate:

- James Milner and Joshua Steckley (Political Science) have been selected as finalists for the prestigious SSHRC Impact Awards.
- Carleton researchers Jennifer Evans, Elisabeth Gilmore, Carmen Robertson and Richard Yu have been named to the Royal Society of Canada.

Finally, the Chair noted the following campus news:

- Rideau House, Carleton's newest residence, officially opened at the end of August, and has added 450 new spaces for students.
- Riverbank Social, Carleton's new full-service restaurant, opened September 15 in Richcraft Hall.
- The Campus Store (formerly The Bookstore) re-opened this summer after renovations, and is now being managed internally for the first time in 28 years.

There were no questions or comments from Senators on the Chair's Remarks.

5. Question Period

Questions were submitted in advance by six Senators.

Questions from Morgan Rooney:

In recent years, SES has required instructors to submit final exams (for photocopying, for setting up in Brightspace, etc.) 10 business days prior to the exam, whereas instructors are only given 10 calendar days (including business days, weekends, holidays, University Closure periods, etc.) to mark exams and to submit final grades.

This discrepancy raises a number of questions:

Where does the "10 calendar days to submit final grades" rule "live," and who "owns" it? It is not in the [Academic Regulations](#), for instance, but surely such matters are Academic in nature and within the scope of Senate's mandate?

Why do we give SES more time to photocopy exams than we give instructors to mark them?

The existing "10 calendar days" policy creates a number of inequitable situations in terms of number of working days instructors are accorded to complete their marking. In April/May, June/July, and August/September, when accounting for weekends and holidays, instructors can have as few as 5 or 6 working days, or as many as 8, during their 10-calendar-day window. In December/January, the situation is even worse: for this year, for instance, instructors with take-home exams only have 2.5 working days (Dec. 22 and 23, and half of Dec. 24) in their 10-calendar-day window before their grades are due on Jan. 2, meaning they are de facto required to work on weekends, on holidays, and

during the University Closure period. What is the rationale for a policy that creates such obvious inequities?

Response provided by J. Brzozowski, Associate Vice-President (Student Life & Student Affairs) and Acting VPSE: The 10 calendar days allotted for grading is an administrative decision that is made in consultation with the Associate Deans. This is reviewed regularly and compared to timeframes at other universities. Within the context of Ontario universities, Carleton's 10 calendar day requirement is on the higher end of days provided for this purpose.

In the Fall of 2024, Scheduling & Examination Services had a total of 19 business days to review exam submissions, print exam copies, generate accessible files and exam day paperwork, while also resolving issues in scheduling, location and accessibility for 51,372 unique student exams. This number does not include extra copies generated for the Paul Menton Centre, or for distance exams, plus online exams and in-person digital exams.

In a follow-up to the response, a Senator noted that there are equity concerns with the current practice, as some Instructors only have 2.5 business days to complete their grading, while others may have as many as 8 business days. The Senator asked if it is possible to make this practice more equitable for Instructors. The Chair agreed to take this question back to the relevant parties for further response.

Nir Hagigi:

In October, the Ford government intends to pass Bill-33 (Supporting Children and Students Act), which includes Section 21.1, giving the province the power to decide which ancillary fees are "required." These fees are what fund essential student services such as crisis response teams, the CUSA service centres (including Mawandoseg, the Wellness Centre, and the Gender and Sexuality Resource Centre), mental health supports, the USC food bank, and the University Health Insurance Plan. If these services are cut, it will directly affect campus safety, accessibility, and student well-being. What steps will the administration take to safeguard these programs, and how will the University advocate and lobby the government to ensure these supports remain protected?

Response provided by J. Brzozowski, Associate Vice-President (Student Life & Student Affairs) and Acting VPSE: Although Bill 33 has been introduced, regulations detailing which specific student fees will be affected by the Bill have not yet been released. The university is actively monitoring developments around this legislation, and is in touch with CASG, CUSA, RRRA and other student groups to keep the dialogue open. The

management of ancillary fees in general is overseen by a committee on campus that includes two senior leaders and two students. Carleton continues to work with partners in the public sector around this issue, and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) has issued a strong statement relative to Bill 33 (Section 21.1) emphasizing the importance of autonomy in enhancing student success.

Kuma Nyediim Buoy:

Have course instructors included a course syllabus statement regarding the use of AI generative tools on their course outlines?

Response from Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic): The Provost normally issues an outline of language recommended for inclusion in course syllabi by the middle of the summer. This year the Provost contacted the Deans on August 11 with suggested language including some recommendations related to Artificial Intelligence.

Alexis Shotwell:

FASS faculty received an email (on Aug. 21), with a note that the “Minimal Course Outline Template” had been updated to include language on AI, asking that that we include at the “minimum” the “suggested text” provided. The [template](#) itself provided more detail, including the same sentence and some other text as the “minimum” for our outlines. The linked to the [TLS page on AI Syllabus Language](#). It is only at the bottom of that page that it is disclosed that the sentence, and all the rest of the “language,” was created with ChatGPT.

Many faculty are not permitting LLM-generated/predictive text content in our classes; many of us have in turn committed to not use chatbots to generate our teaching materials or to communicate with students. For us to be urged to include this language without much clearer disclosure is objectionable. Carleton’s new [AI Hub](#) has a lot of resources on how to use chatbots in our institution, but nothing about choosing not to use them. What has been, and what will be, the process for developing LLM/chatbot policies and practices at Carleton?

Response from Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic): A number of broad-based initiatives are underway to address the use of AI in various contexts in the university including teaching, research, administration and student use. A working group

on the use of AI in the Classroom meets on a quarterly basis to make new recommendations to support instructors in navigating the complex AI landscape. An AI Framework to provide guiding principles when engaging with these types of technologies is also being developed, along with an Acceptable Use Policy for AI in other aspects of the university's operations. Teaching & Learning "Hands-on AI" Workshops are available to assist instructors in working through issues in using this technology. Senators were also encouraged to visit the AI Resource Hub on the Teaching & Learning website, for more information.

In the ensuing discussion, some Senators expressed concern with the fact that the syllabus language urges Instructors to include a statement on the acceptable use of AI in coursework, when a number of professors are making a commitment not to use AI or to allow their students to use it in their courses. Some Senators also objected to the fact that the sentence instructors are asked to include on their syllabi was, in fact, generated by ChatGPT. In response, it was noted that not using AI in a course is a pedagogical choice, but for those who do wish to engage with AI in their teaching, resources are being provided for guidance via the existing working group. The AI-generated language for the syllabus, for example, is modelling how to use Chat GPT.

Another Senator noted that there is often confusion about how Artificial Intelligence (AI) is defined and what it includes. Moving forward, it would be helpful for any discussion of AI to include some definitions and parameters for clarity.

Jody Mason:

In November of 2024, a motion tasked SAGC with the work of investigating practices for chairing Senate. When does SAGC anticipate returning to Senate with a report?

Response from Clerk of Senate Richard Dansereau:

The Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC) confirms that the request was added to the SAGC workplan, but that several other governance tasks, including the review of Faculty Board Constitutions and Senate Committee Terms of Reference needed to be prioritized during the 2024-25 calendar year. The Clerk confirmed that a preliminary review of this issue has been undertaken but more work is needed before the review is ready to present to Senate.

Gabriel Wainer:

Statement on the Self-Declaration Form for Deferred Exams

On November 22, 2022, Senate introduced the Self-Declaration Form for Deferred Exams. While I support the principle behind this initiative—streamlining the process for students facing legitimate challenges—I voted against its implementation due to serious concerns about its practical consequences.

In multiple Senate discussions, I raised the issue of academic integrity. In Engineering alone, up to 30% of students in certain courses have requested deferrals, and many professors have reported a sharp increase in such requests, resulting in significant workload strain. The authenticity of many of these claims is questionable: students often fail to appear for their exams or submit work of extremely poor quality. In some deferred exams, failure rates have reached as high as 90%.

This pattern suggests that the system is being exploited by students who gain an unfair advantage—effectively receiving an extra month to study—without facing any accountability. I have repeatedly emphasized the need for a robust mechanism to verify the legitimacy of deferral claims, to uphold fairness and integrity in our academic processes.

At the time of the vote, the Registrar clarified that falsifying a Self-Declaration Form constitutes a breach of academic integrity, specifically under the category of:

- *Falsified medical or compassionate certificates
(Refer to the [Academic Integrity Policy](#))*

We were advised to report suspected violations to the Dean for investigation. However, as of September 2025, this process has broken down. Dean's offices have ignored such reports. In one instance, a response stated: "We don't generally accuse and formally investigate students of serious violations without better evidence than a suspicion of the instructor"

This directly contradicts the Registrar's guidance and undermines the integrity of our academic standards.

Summary of Concerns:

- *Students are misusing the Self-Declaration Form, not coming to deferred exams or submitting extremely low quality work.*
- *Reports of academic misconduct in such cases are being dismissed.*
- *Honest students are disadvantaged, with no recourse or corrective mechanism.*
- *A culture of unethical behavior is emerging due to the absence of consequences.*

While the current proposal to introduce a fee for deferred exams may help reduce abuse, it does not address the core issue: the lack of an effective system to detect and respond to fraudulent deferral claims.

What are the actions the committee are taking to prevent this problem, ensure ethical behavior and avoid misconduct by students abusing this system? When are they going to be implemented and how? Could the committee take this matter seriously and return to Senate with a concrete, enforceable solution—one that does not place the burden solely on individual instructors?

Response from Chair of SCCASP David Mendeloff: The Registrar's Office continues to track the use of self-declaration applications and Associate Deans are regularly kept apprised of this data. SCCASP is responsible for reviewing the deferred exam regulations and the Academic Consideration Policy. At this point there are no plans to change the policy or regulations, in part because the new system has only been in place for 2 years.

The issues raised by the question warrant a consideration of a broader context beyond the regulations and policy. Other factors contributing to the increase in requests for deferred exams should be considered, including a marked increase in student mental health challenges over the past several years, an increase in demand for formal and informal accommodations, and the fact that more students are working part time which impacts time available for their studies. A re-evaluation of the regulations by SCCASP would not address these factors, and therefore is not advisable at this time.

Some Senators expressed concerns regarding a perceived abuse of the self-declaration form and subsequent application for deferred exams, and asked how to either prevent abuse of the system or identify and sanction those who are abusing it.

A Senator asked if statistics on the use of the self-declaration form could provide an indication of whether or not the system was being abused. For example, if a student is using the form multiple times in one term or regularly over time, could this be an indication of abuse? Others cautioned against drawing a correlation between frequency of use and abuse as there could be many factors involved, especially if the students required accommodations. Another Senator noted that it is important to advise students that deferring exams can put them at a disadvantage, and that a large majority of students who take deferred exams fail them. The Senator also noted that students are now charged a no-show fee to deter them from deferring a single exam multiple times.

Senators discussed whether the question identifies an issue with the policy or with implementation of the policy. The Chair noted that if the issue is implementation of the policy, the proper channel for discussion and further action would be with the Dean's Office. The original poster of the question indicated that they felt the policy also could be reviewed and possibly revised to prevent students from falsifying information on the self-declaration form. The Chair indicated that the appropriate channel in that case would be to request a review of the policy and follow the relevant procedures.

6. Administration

a. Senate Membership Ratification

The Clerk brought forward a memo to ratify 4 new Senators:

- Trevor Lewis – Alumni Representative
- Beth Creary – Board of Governors representative (September – December 2025)
- Nathalie Laporte – Board of Governors representative (January – June 2026)
- Martha Mullally – Faculty member – Faculty of Science

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, K. Graham) that Senate ratify the new Senate appointments, as presented, for service beginning immediately unless otherwise indicated.

The motion **PASSED**.

b. Senate Survey – Summary of Results

The Clerk provided a high-level summary of the results of the 2025 Senate Survey. A report was circulated to Senators in advance.

The 2025 Senate Survey was the 7th annual survey conducted by the Senate Office, and remains a key means of gathering feedback from Senators to evaluate the effectiveness of Senate and identify any areas for improvement. The survey was open for responses from April 1 to May 1, 2025. 23 responses were received, for a response rate of 27%. Although the response rate was lower than average, the survey still provided valuable insights for the Senate Office.

According to the responses received, Senators generally felt confident in their preparation for and participation at Senate over the past year. Most also felt that meetings were appropriate in length, frequency and time allotted for discussion. Strengths identified included efficient running of meetings, reduction in length of presentations and more time for discussion than in previous years. Some concerns and observations shared in the responses included the following:

- An increase in divisions and block-voting within Senate
- Questions for Question Period are sometimes outside of the purview of Senate
- More training is needed for Senators in governance, parliamentary procedure, and the work of Senate committees
- Motions from SCCASP and SQAPC need more explanation and context
- The audio in the Senate Room needs to be improved.

The Clerk noted that the audio issue in the Senate Room has been resolved, and that the Secretariat Office has responded to the call for training by holding a governance workshop on September 12 as the first step in a planned number of professional development activities this year.

The Clerk thanked Senators who responded to the survey. There were no follow-up questions.

7. Reports

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

Committee Chair David Mendeloff presented 2 items for Senate approval and 3 items for information.

Items for approval:

Revisions to undergraduate admissions clarifying English language proficiency requirements

Changes include adding a list of defined countries that are exempt from English competency tests, and adding more certifications (aside from tests) to satisfy Carleton's English language requirements.

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, A. Shotwell) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations UG-ADM-General-4: R-ADM-General-Section 4. English Language Proficiency effective for the 2026-27 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Revision to admissions regulations for B. Accounting, restricting advanced standing to students with 5.0 credits or less.

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, E. Gray) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-2249: R-ADM-Program-B.Acc. effective for the 2026/27 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Items for Information:

- Revisions to Academic Year 2026
- Update to deferred examination application – reference to online application and form added
- Undergraduate minor modifications

b. Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC)

Committee Chair David Hornsby presented one motion for the creation of a new College, 3 cyclical program reviews, and one item for information.

Creation of the College of Global Studies:

FPGA is proposing the creation of a new College of Global Studies that would house the Bachelor of Global & International Studies, the graduate programs in Migration & Diaspora Studies, and the undergraduate and graduate programs in Russian and Eurasian Studies (EURUS).

It was **MOVED** (B. Oneill, S. Burges) that Senate recommends to the Board of Governors the approval of the establishment of the College of Global Studies and the concurrent disestablishment of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies (EURUS) with effect from Fall 2026, and that the governance for the Bachelor of Global and International Studies, the graduate and undergraduate programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies, and the graduate programs in Migration and Diaspora Studies move to the College of Global Studies upon its establishment.

Discussion: In response to a question from a Senator, it was confirmed that a request for this change did not originate with the units, but that all units were consulted and the motion passed at Faculty Board. It was noted, in response to another question, that this restructuring represents an administrative union, and will not change the nature of the programs within the College.

The motion **PASSED**. Senators J. Mason and A. Masoumi requested that their abstention from the vote be recorded in the minutes.

Cyclical Program Reviews:

For efficiency, and with Senate's approval, the motions pertaining to the three cyclical program reviews were combined into an omnibus motion.

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, E. Gray) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries arising from the Cyclical Reviews of the programs.

A Senator noted that the memo erroneously listed graduate programs (plural) in Political Management. The committee Chair proposed a friendly amendment to correct this error.

With this change, the motion as amended **PASSED**. Senator J. Brunet requested that his abstention from the vote be recorded.

Individual motions within the Omnibus:

- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate programs in Economics.
- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the Bachelor of Information Technology – Information Resource Management.
- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the graduate program in Political Management.

Memo for Information: Suspended Program Admissions

Committee Chair David Hornsby presented for information a list of programs approved to suspend admissions for Fall 2025 and Fall 2026. It was noted that the requests for suspended admissions were made by the units, approved by the Deans and Vice-Provost (Academic), and that all necessary administrative steps were taken by Admissions, the Registrar's Office and Graduate Studies. It was also noted that the suspensions will be in effect for two admission cycles unless otherwise indicated, and that any modifications to program reinstatement or closure will be brought to Senate for approval.

- MSC in Northern Studies – for Fall 2025 (MA and GDip admissions for Northern Studies were suspended in June; MSC was mistakenly omitted from the previous memo)
- PhD in Social Work – for Fall 2026. Admissions are being paused for a full program review. It was noted that the program has achieved its target number of admissions for program viability in only 2 of the previous 10 years.

Discussion:

In response to a question, the SQAPC Chair noted that suspensions of admissions should be discussed at Faculty Board meetings, since the requests come from the units and to the Faculty Board through the Dean's office. However, discussion can still occur at Senate, even if the items are presented for information. The committee Chair also noted that the documentation that SQAPC requests for these suspensions are also included in the Senate package, for Senate's information.

A Senator asked for clarification of the process for admission suspensions for interdisciplinary programs that operate across multiple Faculty Boards. The SQAPC Chair responded that the Framework for Admissions Suspensions ensures

that all related parties are notified and consulted. Additionally, it was noted that some interdisciplinary programs, such as Latin American Studies, may pull faculty members from different departments and Faculties to teach in the program, but the program itself is housed within a single Faculty, and any changes to the program would be brought to that Faculty Board.

c. Senate Academic Governance Committee

Committee Chair Richard Dansereau presented a motion for the approval of committee memberships:

- Senate Executive Committee – Zeina Al Attar (Graduate student member)
- Senate Committee on Curriculum Admission and Studies Policy – Atara Lonn (Graduate student member)
- Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee – Mary Francoli (Faculty member, FPGA)
- Senate Academic Governance Committee – Paul Wilson (Faculty member, FPGA)
- Senate Honorary Degrees Committee – Saba Samavati (Graduate student member)
- Senate Academic Integrity Appeals Committee – Vedika Nikarthil Chandran (Graduate student member)
- Senate Committee on Undergraduate Student Awards – David Sabatino (Faculty member, Science)
- Senate Review Committee – Mahdijeh Nasiri (Graduate student member)

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, K. Graham) that Senate ratify the nominees for Senate committees, as presented, for service beginning immediately upon approval.

The Clerk noted that the memo as circulated in the binder was missing one nominee – Professor Mike Murphy (FASS) to serve on the Graduate Student Appeal Committee. He asked for a friendly amendment to add this nominee to the list in the memo. There was no objection from Senate.

With this change, the motion, as amended, **PASSED**.

d. Senate Review Committee

Committee Chair Gabriel Wainer reported that the Senate Review Committee met on September 18 to review the Operating Budget that was presented to Senate in June of 2025. The committee drafted a number of questions on the presentation which were circulated to Senators in the meeting binder.

Provost Pauline Rankin provided the following responses to the questions.

- (i) Are IT Systems included in the Campus Infrastructure expenses category?
Are IT systems supporting research included in the Operating Budget?
Yes, IT Systems are included in the Campus Infrastructure expenses category and IT Systems supporting research are included in the Operating Budget.
- (ii) What is included in the Student Support expense category? Do programs such as I-CUREUS fit into the budget?
This category includes undergraduate and graduate student scholarships. I-CUREUS and similar programs are also included in the operating budget. In a follow-up to this question, it was noted that the I-CUREUS program is directly funded by the Provost's Office.
- (iii) Deferred Maintenance: How is this allocation determined? How are choices made regarding how much to spend and what is most critical?
Allocations for deferred maintenance are made by the Board of Governors, who allow \$14M annually to support deferred maintenance. This is supplemented regularly by \$6M from the Facilities Renewal Program. The choice of how to spend this budget is determined by Facilities Management Planning as part of their long-term capital planning.
- (iv) Where specifically do these interventions intersect with the line items in the operating budget in slide 4? For example, where would the specific savings for "adjusted class sizes and offerings" lie?
 - *Adjusted Class Sizes/Offering & general administrative cuts - \$500,000 falls under Salaries & Benefits and the remainder is under Other Operating Expenses.*
 - *VRIP and Vacant Position Claw-back falls under Salaries & Benefits*
 - *Allocations to Programs falls under Other Expenses*
 - *Position Replacements falls under Salaries & Benefits*

- (v) Position Replacements: Can you provide a breakdown on categories of positions that were replaced (academic staff, non-academic staff, IT staff etc.)?
This process is still ongoing, and the breakdown requested cannot be provided at this time.
- (vi) Aside from the VRIP program, can you provide more information on the general strategy for replacing or not replacing staff (academic and non-academic) who leave the university for a variety of other reasons? There is a perception that these positions are not being replaced and that the current “hiring freeze” applies not only to new hires but also replacement hires for academic staff, and strategic staffing positions like IT, accounting, physical plant, and others. Can you comment on this?
Requests for term and continuing positions (academic and non-academic) are progressing through the position review committee on a case-by-case basis. The goal of the VRIP is to reduce staffing costs, but replacements have been made for critical positions (academic & non-academic).
- (vii) Are faculty members being replaced by Contract Instructors as a cost-cutting measure? *No. Also, decisions regarding courses, sections and staffing for academic departments are made at the Faculty level.*
- (viii) Can you provide 2024-25 actuals for comparison?
The financial statements for 2024-25 will be available as of October 2, when the Board of Governors approve the financial statements of last year. After October 2, these statements will be available for review on the financial reports website.
- (ix) Variance column – can you provide actual numbers instead of percentages (or some form of weighted measure to show the importance to overall budget)?
Actual numbers will be available via the financial statements.
- (x) Operating Deficit without Further Intervention: Can this slide include more detail for 2026-27 (actual numbers)?
Additional detail is not available at this time, but more specific numbers should be available in the new year (2026).
- (xi) Slide 12 Mission Sustainability Framework: Can you provide an update on overall enrolment strategies underway, particularly for international students? Also, can you clarify what is meant by “cross-functional” in this context?

Cross-functional means that more than one portfolio is involved in the process. Enrolment updates can be provided to Senate in a subsequent meeting. Regarding international recruitment, Carleton is considering a number of strategies including pursuing new markets, working with new agents, building relationships with international high schools and offering new scholarship opportunities for international students.

- (xii) Position Review Committee – what kinds of positions are being reviewed? What is the membership of the committee? What does “implemented” mean in this context?
All positions, term and continuing, unionized and non-unionized, are coming to the position review committee for consideration. This is standard practice at other universities, although it is new to Carleton. The committee is co-Chaired by VPFA Duane McNair and the Provost, and draws membership from Vice-President Human Resources and the office of Planning and Budgeting.
- (xiii) Slide 13 Update on Efficiency and Accountability Fund Review: Can you share more information on the EAF Review, now that the summer consultations have concluded? Will Senate receive just one update (October) between now and December or January, when the report is due? Will more information be made available elsewhere?
A preliminary report will be submitted to the provincial government on October 1st, and a full update on the Efficiency & Accountability Review will be presented to Senate in October. The deadline for the final report to the ministry is in December and if requested, another update can be provided to Senate in November. The EAF also will be discussed in the broader university Town Hall on October 14th. Once the report has been finalized, Senate can also receive regular updates in 2026 on the implementation plan.

8. Reports for Information

The following reports were submitted for information.

- a. Senate Executive Committee minutes (May 27, 2025)
- b. Senate Committee Annual Reports
 - i. Senate Student Academic Integrity Appeals Committee (SAIAC)
 - ii. Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee (SUSC)
 - iii. Senate Committee on Undergraduate Student Awards

MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 26, 2025

- iv. Senate Graduate Student Appeals Committee
- c. Senate Annual Report
- d. Board of Governors Chair's Report
- e. Report from COU Academic Colleague

There were no questions and there was no discussion of these reports.

9. Other Business

There was no other business.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned (E. Gray, K. Buoy) at 3:50 p.m.