



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 November 28, 2025 at 2:00 pm
PK608**

MINUTES

Present: M. Agha, Z. Al Attar, I. Alma, D. Amundsen, J. Armstrong, M. Bahran, S. Blanchard, A. Bordeleau, A. Bowker, F. Brouard, J. Brunet, N. Bruni, I. Bumagin, A. Butler, J. P. Corriveau, B. Creary, R. Dansereau (Clerk), T. Davidson, J. Debanne, M. DeRosa, S. Duncan, M. El Sayed, A. El-Roby, R. Goubran, K. Graham, E. Gray, J. Greenberg, T. Haats, N. Hagigi, S. Hawkins, X. Haziza, K. Hellemans, D. Hornsby, A. Hurrelmann, S. Joe-Ezigbo, I. Knezevic, A. Kocsis, G. Lachance, G. Lacroix, T. Lewis, B. MacLeod L. Madokoro, J. Mason, A. Masoumi, D. McNair, D. Mendeloff, R. Miller, K. Nyediin Buoy, Y. Ono, M. Papineau, E. Peirce, P. Rankin, R. Renfroe, M. Rivers-Moore, M. Rooney, C. Ruiz-Martin, A. Shotwell, B. Tackaberry, N. Tait, M. Talebi Dastenaei, W. Tettey (Chair), R. Tfaily, C. Trudel, T. Turbat, M. Vatankhah, G. Wainer, P. Williams, W. Ye

Regrets: M. Mullally, H. Nemiroff, B. O'Neill, K. Patel, S. Sadaf, S. Viel

Absent: A. Arya, S. Burges, N. Giroux-Laplante, G. Maracle, R. Teather

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm. The Chair welcomed all to the third Senate meeting of the 2025-26 academic year.

It was **MOVED** (K. Graham, Z. Al Attar) that Senate approve the agenda for the meeting of Senate on November 28, 2025, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

The Chair reported that a motion related to Item 6(b) would be addressed during Other Business.

2. **Minutes:** October 31, 2025 (open session)

It was **MOVED** (A. Masoumi, M. Papineau) that Senate approve the minutes of the Open Session of the Senate meeting on October 31, 2025, as presented.

The Recording Secretary noted an error in the name of the seconder for the approval of the open agenda in the minutes.

With this change, the motion to approve the minutes as amended **PASSED**.

3. Matters Arising

Senator M. Rooney reminded Senators of a matter arising from the September Senate meeting regarding the number of days Instructors have to complete grading after December exams. Senator Rooney had noted, for example, that because the exam period extends to December 23 in the 2026-27 calendar, some Instructors would have zero business days to complete their work, and would be forced to work over the university closure period to make the grade submission deadline of January 4, 2027.

Vice-President Students & Enrolment Suzanne Blanchard provided an update on this issue. She noted that for 2026-27, the deadline for grade submission for these later exams will be adjusted so that instructors have at least 5 business days to complete the work and submit the grades. She added that the Registrar's Office will take note of and address any similar issues with grade submission dates by extending the deadlines to include at least 5 business days moving forward.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began his remarks by highlighting these recent academic and research achievements in the Carleton community:

- **Jennifer Evans** from the Department of History has been inducted as a Royal Society of Canada (RSC) Fellow for research on misinformation in contemporary authoritarian and populist movements.
- **Elisabeth Gilmore** from the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Norman Paterson School of International Affairs has been named to the College of New Scholars, Artists and Scientists, for bridging engineering and public policy to inform urgent, effective and equitable climate action.

- **Carmen Robertson** from the School for Studies in Art and Culture was recently inducted as an RSC Fellow for her research in contemporary Indigenous arts and constructions of Indigeneity in popular culture.
- **Richard Yu** from the School of Information Technology (cross-appointed to the Department of Systems and Computer Engineering) was inducted as an RSC Fellow for his research into intelligent and autonomous systems, information networks and cybersecurity.

The following researchers were congratulated for appointments to newly created Canada Research Chair (CRC) positions:

- **Kelly Fritsch** from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology – Canada Research Chair in Disability, Health and Social Justice
- **Mohamed Al Guindy** from the Sprott School of Business – Canada Research Chair in Financial Networks and Business Analytics
- **Sriram Subramanian** from the School of Computer Sciences – Canada Research Chair in Artificial Intelligence
- **Jaisie Sin** from the School of Information Technology – Canada Research Chair in Accessibility and Digital Technology

The Chair reported that this year's Stanford-Elsevier list has revealed that 93 of Carleton's researchers are among the top 2% most-cited scholars in the world, an increase from 85 last year. Special mention was made of two Carleton researchers, Biology Professor Steven Cooke, and Mathematics & Statistics Adjunct Professor Daniel Krewski, who are ranked in the top 1% worldwide by citations for field and publication year, in the Web of Science index by Clarivate.

The Chair also congratulated Carleton's Scientist-in-Residence Richard Ernst, who has received the 2025 Synergy Award for Innovation by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

Congratulations were also extended to Professor Mario Santana Quintero, who has been named the UNESCO Chair in Digital Twins for World Heritage Conservation, a first for Carleton and the first in Canada focussed on the World Heritage Convention.

The Chair next reported that the Carleton women's basketball team struck gold at the 2025 FISU 3x3 Basketball University World Cup in Brasilia, Brazil. The Ravens swept through all five games at the competition to capture the title for the first time in program

history. It is also the first time that a Canadian school has won the University World Cup title.

The Chair then reminded Senators that on December 4 the Faculty of Engineering and Design and the Feminist Institute of Social Transformation will host an event on campus to commemorate Canada's National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women. The event, which honours the 14 women killed at École Polytechnique in 1989, will begin at 12:15 pm in the Minto Centre Lobby. Remarks will be followed by a moment of silence and an allyship pledge.

Next, the Chair provided some remarks in response to further questions that were submitted regarding the Task Force for Community Healing and the Draft Policy on Institutional Impartiality.

The Chair noted the tensions and divisions in recent years within Carleton and in the sector, due in large part to geopolitical conflicts and ongoing challenges to equity and inclusion. The Task Force on Community Healing was formed because it became clear, through numerous conversations with various groups across campus, that Carleton's existing structures are not adequate to deal with these issues. The goal of the task force is to first consult with the community to identify the issues of concern, then to seek solutions to them. The Chair added that there is no intentional connection between the Impartiality Policy and the Task Force, though there may be some overlapping themes that emerge.

The Chair next spoke to some questions that have arisen around the proposed Institutional Impartiality Policy. He noted that Carleton is not neutral, and will maintain its commitments to values that were made collaboratively such as EDI /Human Rights Policy and Indigenization. Issues concerning implementation of the policy will be considered on a case-by-case basis within the context of these commitments. He added that on matters that pertain to the entire institution, designated speakers for the university have been identified. Finally, he noted that leaders within the sector have a mandate to be attentive to broader trends in societal attitudes towards universities, and to protect the institution from risk and threats from external forces.

5. Question Period

Four questions were submitted in advance. The first three questions regarding artificial intelligence issues were answered collectively by Vice-Provost David Hornsby.

1) Question from Senator A. Kocsis

The Carleton Senate has taken a stance prohibiting the use of AI to scan student assignments due to copyright concerns and issues of reliability. However, multiple students have reported that some professors are using AI to:

- Develop assignments, tests and examinations without assurance of a proper review by the instructor and;
- Grade student work and generate feedback

Given these reports, what measures are being taken to ensure that AI use by instructors does not undermine the quality of education and what actions are being taken to hold faculty accountable if they are circumventing established policies that are designed to protect students' rights?

2) Question from Senator N. Bruni

As the University is presently defining how AI can intersect in a meaningful and positive manner with the educational experience, many students are fearing the quality of education they are receiving is being eroded by professors overly relying on AI tools to teach their courses. How soon can we expect a University policy dictating the boundaries of AI usage for professors, students, and teaching assistants within the classroom and will there be a community consultation period to allow all community stakeholders (students, professors, and teaching assistants) a chance to share their perspectives?

3) Question from Senator A. Shotwell

Faculty have been advised to, at a minimum, include a “a statement such as” the following in our syllabi for next term: “As our understanding of the uses of AI and its relationship to student work and academic integrity continue to evolve, students are required to discuss their use of AI in any circumstance not described here with the course instructor to ensure it supports the learning goals for the course.” At the bottom of the page elaborating AI statements there is the statement “Note: These draft syllabus statements were developed in collaboration with AI (ChatGPT4.0). AI provided draft rationales for each level of AI use based on the context and goals provided (e.g. university-level, goal of highlighting educational benefits while maintaining academic integrity), developing initial drafts of the statements, and adding specific examples of tools.” Was the statement we are being asked to include in our syllabi generated using ChatGPT? If so, why does the shortened statement we are being asked to include not include the information that it was itself generated by text-prediction?

Response from Vice-Provost David Hornsby: Teaching & Learning Services advises Instructors to use AI tools in courses only when their use supports learning objectives and enhances student learning. TLS offers a variety of resources for Instructors, and encourages instructors to discuss ethical issues related to AI with their students. Instructors are still responsible for the content of course materials, assessments and evaluation of student work. If students have concerns, they are encouraged to communicate these with their Instructor, and if they are not satisfied with the response, to take the matter up with the department Chair.

Vice-Provost Hornsby also noted that it is possible that Instructors are using tools that may appear to be AI but are not. For example, in classes with large enrolments, the Instructor may equip their TAs with standardized feedback responses for common issues. Additionally, homework management platforms that employ procedural processes developed by instructors can give the impression of a standardized AI response.

He also noted that the shorter syllabus statement in quotation marks (Question #3) was not written with the use or assistance of AI.

In response to a follow-up question, Vice-Provost Hornsby confirmed that a draft AI Framework will come to Senate for consultation.

4) Question from Alexis Shotwell (FASS Faculty Board Constitution)

The Chair of the committee currently revising the FASS Faculty Board Constitution heard that the September 2024 version of our Constitution will once more not be brought to the Senate for approval, apparently because we are in the process of revising it further (I am on the committee doing this work). The issue here is not reasoning - we understand that it might seem cumbersome to approve different versions in too-close proximity. However, this really seems to be an inappropriate overstep – it's not a top-down call to decide whether our revised Constitution is ready or not for Senate approval. It is out of order for that decision to be made on our behalf and without informing us directly; FASS sent it in over a year ago, specifically with revisions needed by the transition to the new form of graduate studies administration, and we have now been refused consideration twice – in the first instance by sending it back to Paul Keen with suggested revisions, and now, after we confirmed that this version is all we wanted to revise at this time, it has not been brought forward. What has been the process for this, can someone clarify the logic, and explain?

Response from Clerk of Senate Richard Dansereau: The Clerk began his response by clarifying that the Senate Academic Governance Committee consists of 6 faculty members, 2 students and the Clerk of Senate; upper administration does not intervene in the committee's decisions, and there was no "top-down" call from administration to withhold the FASS Constitution. SAGC unanimously decided not to recommend the FASS Constitution to Senate because the constitution contains a significant number of inaccuracies. The Clerk also noted that, via a motion on June 2, 2023, Senate directed SAGC to review all Faculty Board Constitutions and then recommend them to Senate:

All Line Faculties and the Graduate Faculty Board should revise their constitutions and/or processes to support the transfer of graduate curriculum approvals. The revised constitutions and/or processes be brought to SAGC for consideration. SAGC will bring the revised constitutions and/or processes to Senate for approval. (Minutes: Senate: 2023/06/02)

The motion confirms that SAGC has the authority to review the revised Constitutions before they come to Senate, and that SAGC is the body that brings the Constitutions to Senate for approval.

Finally, the Clerk noted that communication has occurred between SAGC and members of the FASS Faculty Board several times, and that SAGC remains willing and able to work with FASS to address outstanding concerns. In response to a follow-up question the Clerk acknowledged that SAGC had received the FASS process for graduate curriculum approvals, but the rest of the Constitution contained too many errors for SAGC to recommend the entire document.

The Chair also clarified that while individual Faculty Boards have the right to draft their Constitutions, they must adhere to the parameters for Faculty Board Constitutions established by Senate and outlined in our governing documents. It is SAGC's responsibility to ensure that the Constitutions are aligned with these parameters.

6. Administration

a. Senate Membership Ratification

The Clerk presented a motion to ratify 3 new Senators:

- Erin Harlan (UG Student – FASS) – service beginning upon approval
- AbdelRahman Abdou (Faculty member – Computer Science) – service beginning upon approval
- Juan Carlos Jimenez (Faculty member – Industrial Design) – service beginning January 1, 2026

It was **MOVED** (A. Masoumi, N. Hagigi) that Senate ratify the new Senate appointments, as presented, for service beginning immediately upon approval unless otherwise indicated.

The motion **PASSED**.

b. Report on Annual Senate Committee Chairs & Secretaries Meeting

The Clerk reported on the 5th annual Senate Committee Chairs & Secretaries meeting that was held on October 10, 2025. This annual meeting provides Chairs and Secretaries with an opportunity to connect with each other and with the Senate Office, to share information and best practices, and raise any concerns with the Clerk and members of the Secretariat. Topics discussed at this meeting included the roles and responsibilities of Chairs and Secretaries, effective records management, strategies for onboarding new members and succession planning and an overview of the results of the annual committee survey.

c. Report on General Faculty Board Meeting

The Clerk reported that the General Faculty Board (GFB) met on Thursday November 27 from 1:00 – 2:30 pm in the Kailash Mital Theatre. Limited hybrid participation was available for the meeting.

As outlined in the AGU, the GFB is a committee of Senate and serves as a forum for discussion of issues of urgent and general concern to the Carleton community. Membership consists of members of all Faculty Boards combined, with the Clerk of Senate serving as Secretary. Meetings of the GFB may be called by the President or by a petition of at least 25 members. GFB's authority is limited to passing motions to make recommendations to Senate.

A petition signed by 34 faculty members was received by the Clerk on November 5, requesting a GFB meeting to discuss the proposed new Institutional Impartiality Policy. Notice of the meeting was distributed on November 11 – 12 via emails from Faculty Board Secretaries and an all-faculty email.

Approximately 110 members attended in person, and 32 joined online for a total of 142 attendees. Remarks were provided by President Tettey, outlining the rationale for the draft impartiality policy, General Counsel Richard Sinclair, who provided a summary of the online feedback received, and by Dominique Marshall, President of CUASA, who spoke against the policy.

Following discussion from the floor a motion was brought forward asking Senate to recommend that the Board of Governors reject the proposed Institutional Impartiality Policy. An amendment was proposed to the motion, requesting that Senate also urge the Board not to pursue any such policy. The motion, as amended, passed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:23 pm.

7. Reports

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

Committee Chair David Mendeloff presented 5 items for Senate approval and 2 items for information. The items for approval were combined into an omnibus motion.

Items for approval – Omnibus motion

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, M. Papineau) that Senate approve the revisions to the following program regulations effective for the 2026/27 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

- R-UG-COOP-B.A. Women's and Gender Studies
- R-UG-COOP-B.D.A. Admission and Continuation Requirements
- R-UG-CCOP-B.Economics Admission and Continuation Requirements
- R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Humanities
- R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Journalism & Humanities
- R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Music

The motion **PASSED**.

Individual motions from the Omnibus:

- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-UG-COOP-B.A. Women's and Gender Studies Admission and Continuation Requirements

effective for the 2026-27 undergraduate calendar as presented. (introduction of new co-op option to develop experiential learning skills)

- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-UG-COOP-B.D.S. Admission and continuation Requirements effective for the 2026/27 Undergraduate Calendar as presented. (addition of specific course requirements to satisfy co-op term eligibility)
- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-UG-COOP-B.Economics Admission and Continuation Requirements effective for the 2026/27 Undergraduate Calendar as presented. (addition of 2 new courses to replace 2 courses no longer offered)
- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Humanities and R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Journalism and Humanities effective for the 2026/27 Undergraduate Calendar as presented. (update to the ACE requirements)
- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Music effective for the 2026/27 Undergraduate Calendar as presented. (update to ACE requirements)

Items for Information:

- Undergraduate & Graduate Minor Modifications
- Academic Schedule for 2026-27

Discussion:

The Committee Chair noted that some courses in the minor modifications table are connected with major modifications yet to come but were inadvertently included in the binder. These are conditional on the approval of the Quality Assurance Council.

A Senator raised a concern regarding music department course deletions listed in the minor modifications document, particularly those related to opera, chamber music, composition, theatre and globalization. They asked for more context and clarification regarding these decisions.

The Dean of FASS provided a response from the Department of Music. She noted that in 2020 Music embarked on a multi-year systematic review of the Bachelor of Music program with the goal of redesigning the curriculum to better reflect commitments to EDI and social justice. Extensive consultations were

conducted with students, instructors and support staff, and the additions, deletions and revisions submitted this year represent the final stage of the process.

Some courses in Western Art Music have been retired, but other new courses have been introduced to strengthen offerings in Western Art Music, including opera and chamber music. Additionally, special topics courses allow faculty and students to explore aspects of Western Art Music in greater depth also ensuring breadth and flexibility in the curriculum. The intention is to preserve and enhance student opportunities to engage with many musical traditions, including Western Art Music, which is now situated within a more inclusive and forward-looking program.

Finally, the committee Chair noted that for the 2026-27 academic schedule SCCASP was not able to accommodate a study break between the last day of classes and the beginning of the exam period in the Fall 2026 semester. Scheduling and exam services will be made aware and will take this into consideration.

b. Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC)

Committee Chair David Hornsby presented 4 major modifications for Senate approval, 2 cyclical program reviews for approval, and one memo on suspended program admissions for information. The major modifications and cyclical reviews were each combined into omnibus motions.

Major Modifications:

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, T. Lewis) that Senate approve the major modifications as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Individual motions from the Omnibus:

- THAT Senate approve the deletion of the graduate concentration in Arts Management as presented with effect from fall 2026
- THAT Senate approve the introduction of ECMP 5015 as presented with effect from Fall 2025
- THAT Senate approve the degree change in Economics from an MA to an MSC as presented with effect from Fall 2026
- THAT Senate approve the major modification to MUSI5909 as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

Cyclical Program Reviews:

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

The motion **PASSED**.

Program reviews included in the Omnibus:

- Graduate programs in Sustainable Energy
- Graduate & Undergraduate programs in Women's and Gender Studies

Memo for Information: Suspended Program Admissions

Senate was informed of suspended admissions for the Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Economics (for Fall 2026) and an extension of the suspended admissions for the minor in Health Sciences (Fall 2027).

c. Senate Academic Governance Committee

Committee Chair Richard Dansereau presented motions for the approval of updates to two Senate standing committees: the Senate Committee on Medals and Prizes, and the Senate Committee on (Undergraduate) Student Awards.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, K. Graham) that Senate approve the revised Terms of Reference for the Senate Committee on Medals & Prizes, as presented.

Discussion:

In response to a question, the Clerk confirmed that changes were made to the membership to reflect current practice and to update the titles of some of the members. Resources were added as they attend all meetings and contribute important information for the committee.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, S. Blanchard) that Senate approve the revised Terms of Reference for the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Student Awards, as presented, and that the committee be renamed the Senate Committee on Student Awards.

Discussion:

MINUTES – NOVEMBER 28, 2025

Many of the changes listed in the memo result from the addition of graduate student award oversight to the list of committee responsibilities, and include expansion of committee membership and a new name for the committee, in addition to updating member titles and editing language for greater clarity.

The Clerk requested two small amendments to be made to the TOR prior to the Senate vote. “Donor-endowed scholarships” in the first paragraph of the TOR should be changed to “Donor-funded scholarships” since not all of the scholarships the committee deals with are endowed. Also, the word “prizes” at the end of the paragraph should be changed to “awards,” which is the more appropriate term.

With these changes, the motion, as amended, **PASSED**.

d. Senate Executive Committee

The Clerk of Senate presented this item. The Senate Executive Committee presented a motion to approve a temporary replacement for the current COU Academic Colleague (Kim Hellemans) who will be on leave from January 1, 2026 to June 30, 2026. The committee is recommending Professor Paul Wilson for this role.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, J. Greenberg) that Senate approves the appointment of Professor Paul Wilson as COU Academic Colleague from January 1, 2026 to June 30, 2026, as a temporary replacement for Senate Kim Hellemans while she is on leave.

The motion **PASSED**.

8. Presentation on Process for Program Closures

Vice-Provost David Hornsby shared a presentation outlining the process for closing programs. Under the current Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), closure of programs is considered a Track A1 major modification that requires the completion of an Executive Summary.

The Executive Summary provides a description of the change and rationale for the program closure, including enrolment statistics if applicable, effective date and proposed replacement for the program. An account of the impact of the closure on other programs, units, courses, service teaching, TAships and students is also included in the Executive

Summary. Finally, the Executive Summary must also include an account of the impact of the closure on resources, including administrative support, space, and financial implications, and a transition plan for current students.

The Executive Summary is reviewed by the Office of Academic Programs and Strategic Initiatives (APSI), the Dean of the Faculty and the Vice Presidents Academic and Research Committee (VPARC) to ensure compliance with the IQAP and Senate regulations. Once this step is complete and the courseleaf information has been entered, the documentation continues through the approval process, which includes (in order) the unit Chair, Dean, Curriculum Committee of the Faculty, Faculty Board, SCCASP, SQAPC and Senate. The closure is also included in annual reports to the Board of Governors and the Quality Council.

There were no questions from Senators.

9. Motion from Senator Jody Mason

Senator Jody Mason submitted the following motion for Senate's consideration:

Whereas motions for the approval of new programs come to Senate with the full documentation from the Quality Assurance process (a document that is often very lengthy and that includes information about unit- and faculty-level deliberations),

and whereas the current practice for presenting motions related to program closures makes it difficult for Senators to know exactly what they are voting for (such motions tend to appear with a very limited rationale),

it was MOVED (J. Mason, L. Madokoro) that any motion related to the closure of a program at the undergraduate or graduate level (including certificates and diplomas but excluding minors, concentrations, and collaborative specializations) be accompanied with a fulsome rationale that includes:

1. A description and principal rationale for the program closure, including enrolment figures since the last cyclical program review as applicable

2. A description of how resources have affected the decision to close, including:

- faculty resources*
- administrative support*
- space*
- financial considerations*

3. Impact on Other Programs and Students including impact on courses, service teaching, TAships and experiential opportunities

Senator Mason noted that the intent of the motion is to ensure that a robust process is in place so that Senators receive the data and information required to make an informed decision regarding the approval of program closures. She added that the current motion is the result of a collaborative effort with Vice-Provost David Hornsby to ensure that the motion aligns with the IQAP and current procedures.

A Senator noted some concerns with potentially sensitive information coming to Senate and being publicly posted as part of the information requirements. They cited recent requests made to the Senate Office to remove CVs and other confidential information that had been included in a SQAPC appendix and posted on the Senate website. The Chair of SQAPC responded that information provided for program closures would not normally contain any confidential information on faculty members or other individuals. However, moving forward, the SQAPC binders for new programs and program closures will be monitored for any potential risk in this area.

The motion **PASSED**.

10. Efficiency and Accountability Fund (EAF) Review Update

Provost Pauline Rankin provided Senators with an update on the EAF Review Process. The Provost reminded Senators that earlier this year the Ministry of Colleges, Universities, Research Excellence and Security (MCURES) mandated Carleton's participation in a third-party efficiency and accountability review. The EAF Review involves numerous institutions in both college and university sectors, including Carleton. Deloitte was selected as Carleton's third-party consultant to carry out the review.

The EAF Review is comprehensive in scope and covers the following areas:

- Governance, Administration and Student Services
- Academic Programming
- Physical Assets and Facilities
- Collaborative Procurement
- Revenue Generating Opportunities

The ministry is also requiring universities participating in this cycle of the review to present a balanced budget scenario in a 5-year timeline.

A preliminary report was submitted to MCURES in October with a management letter expressing concerns with the exercise. The report outlines a list of opportunities and an overview of Carleton's financial landscape with three 5-year financial scenarios:

- Scenario 1: A baseline position, with no interventions
- Scenario 2: A challenging scenario, with some interventions, but not balanced
- Scenario 3: A more aggressive scenario to bring Carleton closer to a balanced budget

The financial model of Scenario 2 would yield savings of \$30M over 5 years in strengthening strategic alignment, \$1M optimizing operations and \$2M in alternative revenue generation but would still result in an operating deficit of \$52M and the use of \$271M of reserves.

Scenario 3 would yield a financial benefit of \$42M in strengthening strategic alignment, \$4M in optimizing operations, and \$3M in alternative revenue generation, but with an operating deficit of \$37M while using \$229M of reserves. Current reserves that are readily available total \$291M; both scenarios would almost completely deplete these.

To strengthen strategic alignment, opportunities have been identified in recruitment, offering non-credit programming (professional development courses), program costing, and changes to the scholarships grid.

In optimizing operations, the opportunities identified in the review include IT consolidation and standardization, complaint triage (improvements in process to assist and resolve labour disputes), and group procurement in coordination with other universities. For alternative revenue generation, opportunities included charging more for miscellaneous fees, using ancillaries to contribute to operations, and cell tower leases.

Non-financial efficiency improvements and opportunities identified include better governance training, a review of the internal billing and chargeback process, consolidated budgeting, an improved HR information system, and space optimization.

Conclusions drawn from the primary report show that only 4% of the net financial benefit in the aggressive scenario would derive from optimizing the university's operations; most would be driven by revenue generation opportunities. This confirms that Carleton's

operations are already highly efficient, and that the source of our financial challenges is driven by revenue constraints rather than inefficiency.

The final EAF report and implementation plan will be presented to the Board of Governors for endorsement in December, before submission to MCURES in January. Senate will be updated in the new year regarding the final report and implementation plan.

In response to a question, the Provost confirmed that all universities in this current review cycle are expected to submit a balanced budget scenario and for the October report Carleton was the only university that did not do so. This approach was meant to prove a point that the balanced budget scenario was unworkable.

A Senator asked for an update on advocacy efforts. The Provost confirmed that COU has been advocating constantly and lobbying the government on this issue. She added that it is unlikely that tuition will be unfrozen in the short term, but there may be some future flexibility in the funding framework.

The Academic Colleague noted that COU is embarking on a public campaign targeting employers, businesses and communities to change public perception of universities and to show their value.

In response to a question from another Senator, the Provost remarked that although the Ministry is providing some extra funding for STEM programs, this increased funding should not come at the expense of other programs. Data confirm that the majority of Carleton graduates from a variety of programs are finding jobs in their fields within 6 months, and not all of these jobs are in STEM. Universities are continuing to advocate for the value of sustaining comprehensive institutions.

11. Reports for Information

The following reports were submitted for information:

- a) Senate Executive Committee minutes (October 21, 2025)
- b) Report from COU Academic Colleague
- c) Report on the Senate Governance Workshop (September 12, 2025)

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

12. Other Business

MINUTES – NOVEMBER 28, 2025

The General Faculty Board meeting on November 27 resulted in a motion for Senate. This motion was submitted to the Clerk for potential consideration at this Senate meeting, although it was not added to the agenda since it did not meet the 10-day notice of motion requirement.

According to the Senate Rules of Order, a motion may be considered without proper notice if all of the following conditions are met:

- The motion has been received by the Clerk at or before the start of the meeting.
- The motion responds to circumstances that developed after the date for proper notice;
- The action specified in the motion cannot be delayed to permit consideration at the next meeting of Senate;
- The motion addresses an issue of importance to the university; and
- A 2/3 majority of those present agrees to waive the requirement for the notice after hearing the motion read.

The Chair then presented the motion for consideration of these conditions:

MOTION: The General Faculty Board recommends to Senate that Senate recommends to the Board of Governors that they reject the proposed (November 2025 draft) Impartiality Policy, and not pursue any such policy.

The Chair ruled that the first 4 conditions for waiving the notice of motion have been met, and he called for a motion for Senate to vote on waiving the notice of motion.

It was **MOVED** (M. Rivers Moore, J. Mason) that Senate waive the 10-day notice of motion for the motion submitted by the General Faculty Board related to the Impartiality Policy. The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

With the notice-of-motion waived, the Chair then called on a mover and seconder for the GFB motion.

It was **MOVED** (A. Shotwell, A. Masoumi) that upon recommendation by the General Faculty Board, the Senate recommends to the Board of Governors that they reject the proposed (November 2025 draft) Impartiality Policy, and not pursue any such policy. The motion was **DEFEATED**.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned (R. Miller, D. Hornsby) at 3:53 p.m.