



*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 October 31, 2025 at 2:00 pm  
PK608**

**OPEN SESSION  
MINUTES**

**Present:** Z. Al Attar, I. Alma, D. Amundsen, S. Blanchard, A. Bordeleau, A. Bowker, J. Brunet, N. Bruni, I. Bumagin, S. Burges, A. Butler, J. P. Corriveau, B. Creary, R. Dansereau (Clerk), J. Debanné, M. DeRosa, S. Duncan, M. El Sayed, N. Giroux-Laplante, R. Goubran, K. Graham, E. Gray, J. Greenberg, T. Haats, N. Hagigi, S. Hawkins X. Haziza, K. Hellemans, D. Hornsby, 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, M. Papineau, K. Patel, E. Peirce, P. Rankin, R. Renfroe, M. Rivers-Moore, M. Rooney, C. Ruiz-Martin, B. Tackaberry, N. Tate, W. Tettey (Chair), R. Tfaily, C. Trudel, T. Turbat, S. Viel, P. Williams, W. Ye

**Regrets:** J. Armstrong, M. Bahran, F. Brouard, T. Davidson, A. El-Roby, G. Lacroix, G. Maracle, H. Nemiroff, A. Shotwell, M. Talebi Dastenaei, M. Vatankhah, G. Wainer,

**Absent:** A. Hurrelmann, S. Joe-Ezigbo, G. Lacroix, Y. Ono, S. Sadaf, R. Teather

**Recording Secretary:** K. McKinley

---

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:01 pm. The Chair welcomed Senators to the second Senate meeting of the academic year. After a quick review of procedures, the Chair called for a motion to move into Closed Session to approve the fall graduates.

It was **MOVED** (N. Hagigi, B. Tackaberry) that Senate move into the Closed Session of the meeting.

The motion **PASSED**.

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

---

*Minutes after Open Session resumed:*

**Approval of Open Agenda:**

It was **MOVED** (K. Nyediin Buoy, P. Williams) that Senate approve the open agenda for the meeting of Senate on October 31, 2025, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

**2. Minutes:** September 26, 2025 (open session)

It was **MOVED** (E. Gray, M. Papineau) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting on September 26 2025, as presented.

A Senator requested one change to page 5 of the minutes regarding the number of days instructors typically have to complete grading, to specify that these are business days and not calendar days.

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

**3. Matters Arising**

There were none.

**4. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair began his remarks reflecting on the Carleton Ravens recent victory at the 2025 Panda game, where they played to a sold-out crowd of over 23,000 fans. Carleton also hosted the 2025 Throwback Celebration in early October, welcoming over 10,000 alumni and community members back to campus for celebratory events. The Chair thanked everyone who helped to make these events a success.

The Chair next reported that The Canada Foundation for Innovation has awarded \$1.2M to nine Carleton University researchers under the John R. Evans Leaders Fund (JELF). This funding will contribute to a number of initiatives related to mental health, heritage conservation, sonic arts, and solutions for plastic pollution, among others.

The Chair also congratulated Alison Grant, a 1998 NPSIA graduate, on her recent appointment as Ambassador of Canada to Austria.

Finally the Chair noted that the Maclean's 2026 university rankings have been released, and Carleton has been ranked as #4 in the comprehensive university category for the second consecutive year, also securing the #2 spot in Ontario. Carleton also has ranked first for the third consecutive year as Canada's Best University for 2026 for research funding in the field of Social Sciences and Humanities.

## 5. Question Period

Ten questions were submitted in advance by 8 Senators.

### Question from Winnie Ye:

In light of current budget constraints and the reduction in teaching assistant (TA) resources, many faculty members are experiencing increased teaching loads, which significantly limit the time available for research and scholarly activities. To remain competitive as a research-intensive university, it is important that Carleton protect research time for active researchers. Several peer institutions, including the University of Ottawa, have adopted mechanisms such as teaching "credits," course releases, or other workload adjustments to support faculty who maintain strong research programs and external funding. Could Carleton consider implementing similar measures?

*Response from Provost P. Rankin:* Our sector is undergoing a period of rapid change which raises many issues for our university, including concerns for researchers about commitments for their time. Within FED there also have been some changes around the capstone projects which may be contributing to these concerns. However, both teaching assignments and course relief decisions are the purview of Deans in collaboration with Chairs and Directors within individual Faculties, and are not necessarily in the purview of Senate. The question regarding teaching credits is a collective bargaining issue, which also cannot be addressed at Senate.

### Question from Kuma Buoy:

A course outline operates as a contractual agreement between students and the course instructor. That being said, are course instructors allowed to change the course syllabus and if so how, to what extent would this impact final examinations?

*Response from Vice-Provost D. Hornsby:* Carleton University does treat the syllabus as a contract, but changes can be made to it. For example, the academic calendar makes provisions for changes to the syllabus regarding assessments before the last day of registration. In certain exceptional circumstances, additional changes can be made after that date, provided students receive 2 weeks' notice. It is preferable not to have any uncertainty around the dates for final exams and these would only change under exceptional circumstances.

**Question from Emma Peirce:**

Given the protocols and groups addressing how to use AI, are there any initiatives towards reviewing the process of reporting academic integrity concerns, more specifically ensuring adherence from a professor point of view to the current policy?

*Response from Vice-Provost D. Hornsby:* Carleton University does encourage Instructors to experiment in the use of artificial intelligence where it makes sense, and in an ethical and responsible manner. Instructors do maintain the responsibility to evaluate students' work. Artificial intelligence can be used to assist with marking, but this must be clearly disclosed with as much advanced notice as possible. Artificial Intelligence cannot be used, however, when Instructors are checking for Academic Integrity offences.

In a follow-up to the response, the Senator noted that one of the main concerns with the Academic Integrity Policy is that it is inconsistently implemented across Faculties, and that the procedures within the policy are not always followed by Instructors when allegations against students are made. In response, it was noted that Instructors are meant to follow the policy but sometimes mistakes are made and the procedures are not followed correctly. Students do have the opportunity to respond, and every effort is made to have their cases dealt with fairly.

**Question from Maya Papineau**

Senate is legally mandated, as written in Section 22 of the 1952 University Act establishing Carleton University, to:

- “consider and determine all courses of study”;
- “make rules and regulations respecting the conduct and activities of the students of the University”; and

- “make such recommendations as may be deemed proper for achieving the objects and purposes of the University.”

In the same Act, Section 3 states that the objects and purposes of the university are “The advancement of learning”, “The dissemination of knowledge”, “The betterment of its community”, and “The establishment and maintenance of a non-sectarian college”. However, I question why decisions and actions have been made of late that can easily be interpreted as in breach of Carleton’s legal obligations. Two specific questions arise from this:

What is the justification for the suspension of programs not being a voting matter with the full body of Senate, whereas program closures have been deemed as such? Program suspensions are within the first clause of Senate’s authority.

*Response from Vice-Provost D. Hornsby:* Since the suspension of admissions does not involve any curricular changes or substantive changes to the program, there is no need for Senate involvement. The pausing of admissions within programs has been occurring for many years, but has only recently been standardized with a process to ensure transparency. It was noted as well that York, Nipissing, Trent, Ottawa, Queens, and Guelph are operating under a similar framework for treating admission suspensions as an operational matter that does not require Senate approval. In the ensuing discussion Senators continued to discuss Senate’s responsibilities under the Carleton University Act, particularly with regards to admissions.

Question from Morgan Rooney & Cristina Ruiz Martin:

As part of its open binder package in September, Senators received its annual report regarding Academic Integrity. While it seemed to tell a largely good-news story about declining Academic Integrity cases, we noticed that there is no data regarding the number of cases that were submitted but then subsequently dismissed, or anything regarding the rationale for cases that have been dismissed. As we understand it, such data are collected at the faculty level but are not accessible to the Registrar’s Office, which assists in the compilation of the annual Academic Integrity report to Senate. Moving forward, can we ensure that 1) this matter is accounted for in the updated Academic Integrity policy and 2) these data (cases dismissed along with reasons for dismissal) included in the annual Academic Integrity report to Senate?

*Response from Clerk of Senate (and Chair of SAGC) Richard Dansereau:* The Ad Hoc Committee on the Academic Integrity Policy is continuing to meet over the next few

months to finalize their draft of the revised policy. These concerns will be communicated to the committee for consideration at their next meeting.

Questions from Laura Madokoro:

1. In the fall of 2024, Senate began a discussion about the position of Senate Chair. This was referred to SAGC for further investigation. Following on the question raised in the September 2025 meeting of Senate, could Senate please have an update on the status of this investigation with a specific date for delivery?

*Response from Clerk of Senate R. Dansereau:* The investigation into this question is continuing and the Senate Office is actively gathering more information to contribute to the report. Since the last Senate meeting, interviews have been held with Secretariat staff members at universities in which the Senate is not chaired by the President, to provide more in-depth information on these practices. These interviews will continue over the next several weeks after which the research will be presented to SAGC and a report will be generated for Senate. At this time a specific delivery date has not been determined, but staff are working as quickly as possible to be able to deliver this report to Senate.

2. During the September 2025 meeting of Senate, there was considerable interest in the question of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the manner in which Carleton University is engaging with changing technologies and pedagogical practices. During the discussion, there were a number of points that emerged for further clarification.
  - a. How is the university defining AI?
  - b. What policy considerations have been given to agential AI?
  - c. How is the AI Working Group constituted? What mechanisms are in place for Senate to provide input?
  - d. Will the AI Working Group consider amending the existing advice to instructors to include a “no AI” policy (note that the current advice to instructors begins with a minimum level option that assumes at least some AI will be permitted)?

*Response from Vice-Provost D. Hornsby:*

- a) According to the Government of Canada, Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to information technology that can perform tasks typically requiring human cognitive

abilities. Common definitions of different types of AI would normally include the following:

- Generative AI is a specific type of AI that relies upon machine learning model algorithms that simulate the decision-making processes of the human brain. Generative AI identifies and encodes the patterns and relationship in large amounts of data, then uses that information to understand users' natural language requests.
- Large Language Models (LLMs) are a type of generative AI that is trained on massive amounts of text data to generate human-like text and responses. They are powerful tools for understanding, generating and manipulating human language. ChatGPT is one known application.

b) Agentic AI is a recent phenomenon, and includes tools that will act on your behalf to complete forms, process requests, etc. Common applications include Comet by Perplexity and ChatGPT Atlas. The Working Group on AI in Teaching & Learning will convene to consider recent developments related to agentic AI, its implications for teaching and learning and updates to the guidelines for pedagogical practices. It was noted that if one is using one of these agentic browsers when opening Brightspace, the application will be able to complete quizzes.

c) The Working Group on AI in Teaching & Learning is composed of 5 Associate Deans, representing each Faculty, 2 Deans (FASS, Sprott), 3 faculty members who are Future learning Innovation Fellows (from FASS, FED and Science), the Canada Research Chair in Governance and AI (from FPGA) and representatives from the Library, Schedule & Examination Services, and TLS. There is also a Working Group on the Acceptable AI Use, comprised of senior leaders, and representatives from the Provost's Office, the Library, ITS, the Office of the Vice-President (Research, Innovation & International). It is chaired by the Vice-Provost (Academic & Global Learning). This working group drafted the Acceptable Use of AI Policy (under review) and provided feedback on a Draft AI Framework for Carleton, which was prepared by the Office of the Vice-Provost (Academic & Global Learning). Both documents have been distributed (as drafts) to the offices of Deans and Vice-Presidents for their review and will come to Senate for consultation and feedback.

d) Instructors can choose either to integrate AI into their courses or exclude it, according to their learning objectives. Instructors should clearly state their expectations on their course outlines. The minimal use guideline permits students to use AI tools solely for basic word processing tasks such as grammar and spell checks that are already embedded in word processing software. However, beyond these

basic tools, it is up to the individual Instructor to determine whether or not to integrate AI into their courses.

Questions submitted regarding the proposed Institutional Impartiality Policy

Question from Azar Masoumi:

The University has been developing a draft policy on [Institutional Impartiality](#). This policy restricts faculty and academic units in what they can express on websites and official communications. As such, this policy has produced considerable concern regarding academic freedom and norms of self-governance in our University. Would you please clarify: 1) why was this policy developed and what existing problem it is seeking to solve? 2) What will be done with academic units that wish to issue statements in support of a cause or who already have publicly available statements on various issues (for example the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies' statement condemning [Russia's invasion of Ukraine](#)?)

Question from Nir Hagigi:

The “Institutional Impartiality” policy under consideration, previously named the “Institutional non-partisanship” policy, would be the most repressive policy at any Canadian university. It will endanger Carleton University’s ability to contribute to its legally mandated objectives of community betterment and the dissemination of knowledge. Unlike policies at other institutions, which only apply to official university-wide communications, Carleton’s policy directly impacts faculties, departments, and student groups under CASG. No other policy in Canada even mentions “students.” How does the university reconcile this? What punishments will apply if these bodies break the policy? Carleton is situated on the unceded and unsurrendered lands of the Algonquin people. If this policy passes, does this mean that the institution will ditch its mandate to Indigenous people because it does “not directly affect its core mission or purpose?” The consultation page’s FAQ section says that issuing statements on political or public issues “risks marginalizing dissenting views.” Is it the university position that views such as “residential schools were not even that bad” or “climate change is a hoax being pushed by Jewish globalists” SHOULDN’T be marginalized?

Question from Maya Papineau:

MINUTES – OCTOBER 31, 2025

Why has a wide-ranging “institutional impartiality” policy been developed by the President’s office, with approval authority by the Board of Governors, without informing Senate? This policy will have implications on the legally mandated academic mission of the university and more broadly its objects and purposes.

*Collective response from Chair of Senate and President W. Tettey:* The President began by thanking all who have contributed feedback on the draft policy for their input and engagement. Acknowledging that there have been strong feelings about the draft, he asked Senators to stay true to their commitment to work together in trust, and in particular to avoid misrepresentations of both the draft policy and the consultation process currently underway. He added that consultations are standard practice whenever a new policy is introduced, and are a valuable process for gathering input from the community.

The President then noted that academic units (departments, schools, Faculties) are creations of Senate approved by the Board, and as such are an extension of the administrative arm of the university. The policy seeks to clarify that these administrative units cannot claim to speak for their individual members, who are not a monolith. As an institution, Carleton has an obligation to create space for individuals to share ideas and to speak freely but the institution cannot claim to speak on behalf of all its constituents. Similarly, Chairs, Directors, and Deans cannot claim to speak on behalf of the whole collective of individuals within their units. This is the problem the policy seeks to address.

If the policy is adopted and approved, any existing statements made publicly by units on university websites will be assessed individually and addressed accordingly. However, the process for evaluating and addressing suspected violations of the policy, should it be adopted, has yet to be determined.

In responding to Senator Hagigi’s question, the Chair first clarified that there was no pre-existing institutional non-partisanship policy, and that consultations for the current policy began as conversations with Chairs and other leaders before opening feedback to the greater community. The Chair also confirmed that the policy does not apply to students or student groups such as CUSA, CASG or GSA.

The Chair also noted that the policy is not called a neutrality policy because Carleton will continue to defend fundamental values of equity, diversity and inclusion and

Indigenization, as outlined in Carleton’s policies. He noted also that the draft impartiality policy is not a policy of Senate so will not come to Senate for approval, but that all Senators do have the opportunity to provide feedback through the normal channels, and are encouraged to do so. The deadline for receiving feedback was extended by one week to November 7, 2025.

In the ensuing discussion, some Senators asserted that departments and units should have the right and autonomy to make public statements and to take a public position on an issue. In response the Chair noted that the rights to use Carleton assets, including websites, are not unfettered, and that the university must manage risks to the institution. Under the policy, a group or collective of individual faculty members would be free to take a position on an issue, but departments and units cannot take a public position on behalf of all of their constituents. For example, it would be acceptable to say “Faculty members from the Institute of X would like to express their condemnation of Y,” but it would not be acceptable to say “The Institute of X condemns Y.”

Some Senators also probed the statement that Carleton will continue to defend fundamental core values, asking who determines what those values are, and whether those values could become politicized as they have been (EDI, for example) in the United States. In response it was noted that these values are reflected in Carleton’s Human Rights Policy, other policies, strategic plans, and frameworks that define our institutional principles and reflect our collective commitments.

The Chair thanked Senators for the robust discussion and encouraged those who wish to provide feedback to take advantage of the extended deadline for online submissions.

## 6. Administration (Clerk)

### a. Membership Ratification

The Clerk presented a motion to approve two new members of Senate:

- Brett Tackaberry - Board of Governors representative
- Menna Agha – Faculty member – FED / Architecture

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, N. Hagigi) that Senate ratify the new Senate appointments, as presented, for service beginning immediately.

The motion **PASSED**.

**b. Report on Annual Senate Committee Chairs/Secretaries meeting**

This item was deferred to the next meeting in November, due to time constraints.

**7. Reports:**

**a. Senate Committee on Curriculum Admission and Studies Policy (SCCASP)**

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

Update to advanced standing admission requirements for Nursing program

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, M. DeRosa) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-2262 R-ADM-Program-Nursing B.Sc.N. effective for the 2026/27 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

New general admission regulation permitting direct entry into PhD prog for exceptional applicants.

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, B. MacLeod) that Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-GR-2 Graduate General Regulations 2. Admission Requirements and Eligibility effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Clarification of some graduate regulations regarding advanced standing

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, M. Papineau) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-GR-6 Graduate General Regulations: 6. Advanced Standing (Transfer of Credit) effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Removal of limit on number of audited courses students in graduate programs can take

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, Z. Al Attar) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-GR-7 General Regulations: 7 Registration and Course Selection effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Clarification of continuous enrolment requirement; students in programs with Master's or PhD thesis must register in their thesis in first term of study  
It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, J. Debanne) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-GR-8 Graduate General Regulations 8. Continuous Registration effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Clarification of time limits for PhD completion – new definition of doctoral candidacy and course obsolescence

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, J. Greenberg) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-GR-13 General Regulations 13. Time Limits for Program Completion effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented.

Discussion:

The regulation defines expectations for what doctoral candidacy should achieve. One issue raised in discussion is that the definition might be too restrictive and may not capture some milestones that occur later in the process, such as thesis colloquia. Graduate Studies has agreed to reach out to all programs to identify these extra milestones and include them in program-specific requirements as exceptions to the general regulation.

The motion **PASSED**.

The following items were circulated in advance for information:

- Undergraduate minor modifications from October 2025
- Graduate minor modifications from October 2025

There was no discussion of SCCASP's items for information.

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

Committee Chair David Hornsby presented for approval one new program approval and three cyclical review reports. An additional item was presented for information.

Items for approval:

### New Program

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, M. DeRosa) that Senate approve the proposed Master's in Mineral Exploration and Resource Management program as presented to commence in Fall 2026.

#### Discussion:

A Senator noted that fully online programs such as this one are vulnerable to various academic integrity issues, and asked what protections would be in place, particularly with regards to assessments. It was noted that the online degree is geared towards professionals already working in industry but seeking extra training. Some synchronous opportunities and potential field-based activities will be added to balance the asynchronous components. The Faculty is aware of the issues involved in offering the program online and is developing a number of strategies to mitigate risks.

The motion **PASSED**.

### Cyclical Reviews

These were combined into an omnibus motion, with Senate's approval.

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, A. Bowker) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries arising from the cyclical reviews of the programs.

The motion **PASSED**.

#### Individual motions from the Omnibus:

- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the joint graduate programs in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the graduate and undergraduate programs in Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies
- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the graduate and undergraduate programs in Music

### Item for Information – Suspended program admissions

MINUTES – OCTOBER 31, 2025

Committee Chair David Hornsby presented for information a list of programs whose admissions have been suspended. Two programs on the list were approved for an extension to admission suspensions for an additional cycle. One program (M. Eng. in Infrastructure Protection & International Security) is suspending admissions for Fall 2026.

**c. Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC)**

Committee Chair Richard Dansereau presented one motion to ratify Senate committee nominees and three motions to approve Senate nomination and election procedures.

Committee nominations:

- SQAPC – Dwight Deugo – Science faculty member nominee
- Senate Graduate Student Appeal Committee – Safaa Bedawi – faculty member nominee

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

A Senator asked if faculty members within the Teaching Stream are eligible to serve on the Graduate Student Appeal Committee. The Clerk noted that currently there is no restriction preventing teaching stream faculty members from serving on this committee.

The motion **PASSED**.

Senate Nomination, Election and Appointment Procedures:

Three documents were circulated in advance to Senators, outlining established protocols for internal election procedures, appointments to Senate, and the nomination and election of faculty members to other bodies, including the Board of Governors. The Clerk noted some formatting issues with the first memo included in the binder; a revised memo was subsequently displayed for Senators at the meeting.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, B. Tackaberry) that Senate approve the Senate Internal Election Procedures, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, R. Renfroe) that Senate approve the Senate Appointment Procedures for the COU Academic Colleague, Alumni Representative and Clerk of Senate, as presented.

A Senator asked for clarification on the language used for the section outlining the procedure for the appointment of the Clerk of Senate. The Clerk confirmed that Senate votes on the nomination brought forward by the Senate Executive Committee, and can vote to approve or not approve the candidate. If Senate chooses not to approve, the matter would be referred back to the Senate Executive Committee.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, K. Graham) that Senate approve the Senate Procedures for Elections to Other Bodies, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

**8. Presentation on Process for Program Closures (D. Hornsby)**

This item was deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time.

**9. EAF Review Update (Provost)**

This item was deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time.

**10. Reports for Information:**

- a.** Senate Executive Minutes (September 16, 2025 + E-poll on October 1, 2025)
- b.** Strategic Integrated Plan (SIP) Fall 2025 Implementation Report

There was no discussion of these items.

**11. Other Business**

None was identified.

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned (E. Gray, J. Debanné) at 4:00 pm.