

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 March 27, 2026 at 2:00 pm
Pigiarvik 608**

AGENDA

Open Session:

- 1. Approval of Agenda**
- 2. Minutes (Open):** February 27, 2026
- 3. Matters Arising**
- 4. Chair's Remarks**
- 5. Question Period**
- 6. Administration (Clerk)**
 - a. Membership Ratifications
- 7. Reports:**
 - a. SCCASP (D. Mendeloff)
 - b. SQAPC (D. Hornsby)
 - c. SAGC (R. Dansereau)
- 8. Artificial Intelligence Framework**
- 9. Reports for Information:**
 - a. Senate Executive Minutes (February 17, 2026)
 - b. COU Academic Colleague Report
- 10. Other Business**
- 11. Adjournment**

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 February 27, 2026 at 2:00 pm
PK608

OPEN SESSION
MINUTES

Present: A. Abdou, Z. Al Attar, I. Alma, D. Amundsen, J. Armstrong, S. Blanchard, A. Bowker, J. Brunet, N. Bruni, I. Bumagin, S. Burges, A. Butler, J. P. Corriveau, R. Dansereau (Clerk), J. Debanné, J. Drake, S. Duncan, M. Francoli, R. Goubran, K. Graham, E. Gray, J. Greenberg, S. Hawkins, X. Haziza, A. Hurrelmann, J. C. Jimenez, I. Knezevic, G. Lachance, T. Lewis, B. MacLeod, L. Madokoro, G. Maracle, A. Masoumi, D. McNair, D. Mendeloff, R. Miller, M. Mullally, M. Papineau, E. Peirce, P. Rankin, R. Renfroe, M. Rivers-Moore, M. Rooney, C. Ruiz-Martin, B. Tackaberry, N. Tait, W. Tettey (Chair), C. Trudel, S. Viel, G. Wainer, P. Williams, P. Wilson, W. Ye

Regrets: M. Bahran, A. Bordeleau, F. Brouard, M. DeRosa, N. Hagigi, D. Hornsby, G. Lacroix, J. Mason, H. Nemiroff, S. Sadaf, A. Shotwell, R. Tfaily

Absent: M. Agha, A. Arya, T. Davidson, A. El-Roby, M. El Sayed, N. Giroux-Laplante, E. Harlan, S. Joe-Ezigbo, A. Kocsis, N. Laporte, K. Nyediin Buoy, K. Patel, M. Talebi Dastenaiei, T. Turbat, M. Vatankhah

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

1. Welcome and Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:01 pm. The Chair welcomed Senators to the second Senate meeting of 2026. He acknowledged the passing of Elly Alboim, a distinguished journalism professor at Carleton and former CBC Parliamentary Bureau Chief. The Chair offered condolences to their family, colleagues, friends and former students.

After a quick review of procedures, the Chair called for a motion to move into Closed Session to approve the winter graduates.

It was **MOVED** (G Wainer, A. Masoumi) 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** (J. Greenberg, B. Tackaberry) that Senate approve the open agenda for the meeting of Senate on February 27, 2026, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

2. Minutes: January 30, 2026 (open session)

It was **MOVED** (R. Renfroe, S. Viel) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting on January 30, 2026, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

3. Matters Arising

There were none.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair shared the following recent updates and achievements from the Carleton community:

- For the second time, Carleton has earned a Gold Rating through the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS), reflecting continued progress in embedding sustainability in our academic, operational, planning and community endeavours.
- Carleton's EDIT-STEM initiative has secured over \$3.3M in research funding through support from NSERC, Mitacs, and national partners. This initiative advances equity, diversity and inclusion in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, and reflects Carleton's national leadership in inclusive research excellence and pedagogy.
- Carleton has received \$1M from the Government of Ontario through the Training Equipment and Renewal Fund to modernize classrooms and enhance AI literacy

across campus. This investment will support learning environments and will expand hands-on educational technologies for students, faculty and staff.

- The Experiential Learning Hub Media Team has received the Maple Media Distinction Award for its innovative Teaching Toolkit project, highlighting the transformative potential of digital storytelling in higher education.

The Chair then acknowledged the following 6 recipients of the 2025-26 Future Learning Innovation Fellowship, awarded through Teaching & Learning Services to support faculty in advancing teaching and learning through immersive technologies and digital innovation:

- Manjeet Birk, from the Feminist Institute of Social Transformation
- Mehdi Eshaghi, from the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
- Eva Kartchava, from the School of Linguistics and Language Studies
- Lama Mourad, from the Norman Paterson School of International Studies
- Mike Murphy, from the School of Linguistics and Language Studies
- Jesse Stewart, from the School for Studies in Art and Culture: Music

The Chair next spoke to the recent announcement by the provincial government of new funding for Ontario's postsecondary sector, along with changes to the OSAP framework and a lifting of the freeze on domestic tuition. He noted that the Provost will provide more information on this item when she presents the EAF Review Update later in the agenda and, therefore, any questions on the announcement should be held until that agenda item.

Finally, the Chair highlighted the following recent events:

- Carleton Ravens women's basketball team won their 5th consecutive victory at the Capital Hoops Classic. The men's team put forward a strong effort but fell to the Ottawa Gee-Gees.
- Carleton has marked Black History month with programming that celebrates the achievements and contributions of Black communities while acknowledging that inclusion must be a year-round commitment. In celebration of Black History Month, the Department of Equity and Inclusive Communities will be distributing free care-packages to Black community members and the School of Social Work will be hosting an upcoming keynote event on March 11. All are welcome to attend.

There were no questions from Senators.

5. Question Period

One question was submitted in advance by Senator Cristina Ruiz-Martin.

In the June 2025 minutes, page 10, it states: “*Revision of Academic Integrity Policy – an Ad Hoc Committee on the Academic Integrity Policy has been working on this, and it is nearing completion.*” The Senate expected to see the policy at the September 2025 meeting. What is the current state? When is the Senate expected to receive the draft of the policy for feedback? Will the new policy be in place for the start of the 2026-2027 academic year?

The Clerk of Senate responded to this question: The Ad Hoc Committee on the Academic Integrity Policy is nearing the final stages of its work in revising the policy. A final draft is being prepared and will be released to the community in March for a two-week consultation period. The committee will then reconvene to review the feedback received and to incorporate revisions of the policy as appropriate before bringing the final draft to Senate for consideration and approval. If approved, the policy can be in place for the 2026-27 academic year.

In response to a question, the Clerk confirmed that the consultation period could be expanded to three weeks, to allow additional time for feedback.

6. Administration (Clerk)

a. Senate Schedule 2026-27

The Clerk presented the meeting schedule for Senate for the 2026-27 academic year. There were no questions and there was no discussion of this item.

7. Reports:

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

Committee Chair David Mendeloff presented three items for Senate approval. These were combined into an omnibus motion for efficiency.

Omnibus Motion:

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, R. Renfro) that Senate approve the revisions to the following regulations as presented: R-ADM-Program-B.I.T., R-GR-3 Application for Admission, and R-GR-6 Advanced Standing.
The motion **PASSED**.

Individual motions from the Omnibus:

- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-ADM-Program-B.I.T. effective for the 2027/28 Undergraduate Calendar as presented. (Motion is for

- changes to admission requirements for the BIT program)
- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-GR-3 Application for Admission effective for the 2026/27 Graduate calendar as presented. (Motion is for changes to the English Language proficiency section of graduate regulations to align with recent changes to the TOEFL scoring scale)
 - THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-GR-6 Advanced Standing effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented. (Motion is for two changes to graduate regulations on advanced standing, one regarding transfer of credit and the other regarding concurrent enrolment)

b. Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC)

Committee Chair Richard Dansereau presented two items for Senate approval and one for information.

Question Period Guidelines (for approval)

SAGC has prepared Question Period Guidelines to enhance transparency and clarify how questions are reviewed and addressed. The guidelines also propose transferring the responsibility for reviewing questions to the Senate Executive Committee.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, J. Greenberg) that Senate adopt the Senate Question Period Guidelines, as presented.

Discussion:

Senators expressed an appreciation for the establishment of guidelines to clarify the process involved in bringing questions to Question Period, but also raised a number of concerns:

- “The Question Period shall not exceed 30 minutes” – It was suggested that the language in point #1 be softened to allow the Chair the discretion to extend the time for Question Period if needed. The Chair added that this has been the practice in the past, and that the 30-minute limit is a guideline, to ensure that there is adequate time for the core business of Senate.
- A Senator asked for an amendment to Point #1:

It was **MOVED** that the language of the second sentence in point #1 of the Guidelines be changed to “The Question Period normally should not

exceed thirty minutes.” (S. Viel, X. Haziza). The motion to amend point #1 of the guidelines **PASSED**.

- Point #9. It was **MOVED** (E. Gray, R. Renfroe) that point #9 in the Guidelines be amended to indicate that questions not addressed would be carried forward to the beginning of the Question Period at the next Senate.
 - Following a discussion of this amendment and various possible further tweaks to it, Senators determined that it would be more fruitful to allow SAGC to review all comments received by Senators, amend the document as needed, and bring it back to Senate for further discussion and approval.

The motion to amend point #9 was **WITHDRAWN**.

- Additional commentary: Point #5 + Table of Examples (end of document) Some Senators felt that the table of examples showing what is within and outside of the purview of Senate is too restrictive. It was noted that topics normally considered outside the purview of Senate are sometimes on the Senate agenda for discussion and/or information (budget, impartiality policy, EAF Funding Review). Senators suggested either removing the table, modifying the examples outside the purview of Senate, or adding language to indicate that the Senate Executive Committee has the flexibility to include other items if the topics are deemed important and timely for Senate.

The original motion was also **WITHDRAWN** by the mover with the consent of the seconder and Senate.

Revised Senate Executive Committee Terms of Reference (TOR) (for approval)

The Committee Chair next presented a revised Senate Executive Committee TOR for Senate approval. The following revisions were proposed through the memo:

- Adding the responsibility for reviewing Senate Question Period submissions for Senate meetings
- Incorporating the two enduring empowering motions of Senate (#4 and #5) into the Terms of Reference

- Separating voting members from resource personnel in the Membership section
- Updating the reporting section to reflect the reporting protocols that apply when Senate Executive is acting on behalf of Senate (i.e. #4 and #5, the former empowering motions)
- Specifying the appointments to Senate (Clerk of Senate, Alumni Representative, and COU Academic Colleague) for which the Senate Executive Committee is responsible for recommending an individual to Senate for approval
- Removing the former responsibility that allowed Senate Executive to approve honorary degree recipients in special-case situations, ensuring that all honorary degree decisions are handled directly by the Honorary Degrees Committee and Senate

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, S. Viel) that Senate approve the revised Terms of Reference for the Senate Executive Committee, as presented.

The Committee Chair noted that since the previous motion was withdrawn, the Senate Executive Committee would have the authority to review the questions for Question Period, but they would do so without guidelines, until those are approved by Senate.

A Senator stated that, in their view, it would not be appropriate to include in the TOR reference to guidelines that do not exist.

It was **MOVED** (M. Rooney, A. Abdou) that item #3 in the Responsibilities of the proposed Senate Executive Committee Terms of Reference (*Review Question Period Submissions ... in accordance with the Question Period Guidelines...*) be struck from the TOR.

The Chair reported for Senators' information that it is possible to pass legislation subject to regulations that follow, and that this is common practice.

The motion to strike item #3 from the TOR was **DEFEATED**.

The original motion to approve the TOR **PASSED**. Senator A. Masoumi requested that her abstention to the motion be registered in the minutes.

Item for Information: Chair of Senate Benchmarking Study

The SAGC Chair reminded Senators that SAGC had been asked by Senate to review Carleton's long-standing model in which the President serves as the Chair of Senate, a practice in place since 1949. SAGC began with a national benchmarking study that included 80 universities, then interviewed institutions using an elected faculty member as Chair of Senate. The results show that approximately 84% of universities in Canada have an ex officio Chair of Senate which in most cases is the President of the university. Those institutions with an elected Chair of Senate have indicated the benefit of increased engagement among faculty members, but also report significant challenges with continuity and the ability of the elected faculty-member Chair to maintain impartiality. The Committee Chair reminded Senators that any change in Carleton's model would require the approval of both Board and Senate. He also noted that Carleton is unique among all universities surveyed in having a Clerk of Senate, a position that provides a leadership role for a faculty member on Senate.

There was no further discussion of this item by Senators.

c. Senate Review Committee – Library Report

Committee Chair Gabriel Wainer introduced this item and reported that the Senate Review Committee met on February 13th. Following a thorough review of the Library Report, the committee submitted a list of questions to the Librarian. Both the questions from Senate Review Committee and the written responses from the University Librarian were included in the Senate meeting binder, along with copies of the Library Report and the most recent Library Client Survey Finding Report.

University Librarian Amber Butler then spoke to the report for Senators. Adapted from the Library's regular annual report, the Library Report for Senate noted strong overall performance and steady demand for core services, with survey results showing high satisfaction for service delivery and information resources, alongside continued pressure for more group and quiet study space. The report also cited space improvements, an Innovation Award from the Buildings Without Barriers Challenge, and consistently strong satisfaction ratings in national student surveys. The University Librarian added that the report included information on activities that may be less well-known to Senators, such as support for scholarly publishing, data management and collections/acquisitions management.

A Senator asked for more information on cuts to academic journals and databases,

particularly those supporting international research, as some appear to no longer to be available. The University Librarian responded that most cuts have been made to the operational side of the budget rather than collections, but that she can follow up with individuals offline with more information on any specific journals or databases in question.

A Senator asked if cuts to staffing have impacted service level quality. The University Librarian noted that staffing changes have occurred for a variety of reasons, including changes in technology, pedagogical practices, and program offerings. Details on these adjustments are publicly available on the library website. She added that the library continues to elicit feedback on service-level satisfaction from Faculties and so far has not received any complaints.

The Chair thanked the University Librarian and Chair of the Review Committee for this report.

8. EAF Review Update (Provost)

Provost Pauline Rankin provided Senators with an update on the Ontario Ministry's Efficiency and Accountability Fund Review. She reminded Senators that Carleton was required to submit a preliminary report in October with a 5-year financial summary including Deloitte's recommendations towards a balanced scenario. Although a balanced budget scenario was not submitted with the October report, Carleton was required to do so for the final report to the Ministry in December.

Following consultations with various stakeholders at Carleton, Deloitte identified a number of key opportunities, categorized into cost saving, revenue generation and non-financial efficiency improvement opportunities.

To strengthen strategic alignment opportunities Deloitte recommended expanding non-credit programming, enhancing coordination with Recruitment, leveraging the academic program costing model, implementing strategic workforce planning, and challenging the current scholarship grid and policies.

To optimize operations, it was suggested that Carleton could consolidate the management of the IT systems, enhance efficacy of the complaint response process and streamline institution-wide procurement policies and practices.

Alternative revenue generation opportunities suggested included additional revenue through miscellaneous fees; leveraging Carleton's real estate assets, including expanding cell tower leases; increasing the financial contribution of Ancillary services to University operations; and considering alternative plans for the Dominion Chalmers Centre.

Non-financial suggestions for improvements included providing tailored governance training

to targeted groups within the university; re-evaluating the internal billing and chargeback processes within FMP and across the institution; integrating the budgeting process for operating and ancillary services; optimizing HR processes; and increasing utilization of campus facilities through conversion of underused spaces and the introduction of a centralized scheduling and booking system.

The financial analysis in the report is built around three scenarios:

- Scenario 1 - Baseline Scenario - assuming no further interventions would occur. The projected deficit for this scenario would reach \$100.90M by 2030-31.
- Scenario 2 - Challenging Scenario – which is feasible but requires significant institution-wide effort. The result would be a \$38.3M deficit for 2030-31.
- Scenario 3 - Mandated Balanced Scenario – outlines a potential plan to achieve financial sustainability. This path would require all elements to unfold exactly as planned and under ideal conditions.

Mapping the 3 scenarios onto the opportunity categories suggested by Deloitte reveals that actions to optimize operations would only yield a net financial benefit by 2030-31 of \$1.3M for scenario 2, and \$3.9M for scenario 3. Actions to strengthen strategic alignment (recruitment, scholarships, workforce planning etc.) would have the largest potential impact by 2030-31, at a \$59.6M benefit for scenario 2, and \$83.6M for scenario 3. Alternative revenue generation opportunities would be projected to yield \$1.7M under scenario 2 and potentially \$13.4M for scenario 3, but only with the sale of assets, which would raise potential legal and fiduciary issues for the university.

The Provost noted that both the Board of Governors and management have recognized certain limitations in the report submitted by Deloitte. For instance, several of Deloitte's suggestions would provide only minimal benefit and would pull staffing resources away from supporting the core mission of the university. Suggestions for strategic workforce planning are being addressed by some of the actions that the university has already undertaken, specifically through the VRIP and attrition. Additionally, the suggestion of selling a major asset would not benefit the university structurally for the long term.

Actioning these suggestions through an implementation plan also carries significant operational risk for the university, as it would be difficult to implement changes that require greater staffing and resources, while simultaneously cutting those resources through additional workforce planning measures.

The next step in the process will be a progress report submitted to the Ministry on April 30th that will focus on recruitment efforts and outcomes.

The Provost next provided some commentary on the provincial government's announcement on February 12, regarding a \$6.4 billion investment in the college-university sector over 4 years. Although many details have yet to be clarified, the package includes \$1.7B for new seats in high-demand fields (likely STEM, Health, Trades), \$3.3B for high-cost program

support, and \$1.1B to increase the base per-student funding. The tuition freeze for domestic students is also being lifted, allowing for annual increases of up to 2% which translates to approximately \$4M a year, starting in 2026-27. Although this is welcome news, the increase falls short of what is needed and what was recommended by the Blue Ribbon Panel in its report to the Ministry in 2023.

The government also announced structural changes to OSAP which would decrease significantly the bursary portion of the funding for students. This will greatly disadvantage many students in Ontario and institutions will be impacted as well. It is worth noting that the Blue Ribbon Panel had recommended increasing the bursary portion in its report.

VPSE Suzanne Blanchard spoke to the supports that Carleton can provide to students given these new financial challenges. She confirmed that funds have been set aside in the form of bursaries and emergency funds and there will be additional care supports to assist students. More information will be available to students in Fall 2026.

A Senator asked for clarification regarding the potential financial contributions from Ancillary Services, mentioned earlier in the presentation. The Provost explained that Ancillary Services generate revenue to support their operations (for staffing etc.), but extra funds generated can also be put towards the operating budget. Deloitte suggested regularizing and increasing this practice.

In response to another question, the Provost noted that one key benefit of this exercise is that it has demonstrated that Carleton, like other universities in our province, is already operating at a highly efficient level, since Deloitte could not find inefficiencies in our processes. The review also demonstrates to the broader community that universities have not been mismanaging their operations, and that the problems the sector is facing are due to underfunding.

In response to a question about the Dominion Chalmers Centre, the Provost explained that the purchase of the Dominion Chalmers Church was part of a long-term strategy for the Board, and they would therefore have a fiduciary responsibility to continue with this vision to support the long-term economic health of the institution.

Senators asked for more commentary on how the changes to OSAP would affect Carleton's enrolment and residence occupancy rates. VPSE Blanchard responded that current residency numbers are strong at 96%, and as more students are recruited from outside of Ottawa these rates will continue to be high. The RO is also projecting an increase in first-year enrollment for next year, especially given the anticipated increase in the 18-24-year-old demographic in Ottawa.

The Chair wrapped up the conversation noting that even with the increase in funding as announced by the government, the structural issue caused by years of underfunding remains, and there is more work to be done. Assistance for students, given affordability issues, will be

an important consideration in the near future. The Chair called upon all, as part of ongoing work to address the university's structural challenges, to consider how we make our students feel when they come to campus and how we can best project our institution to the outside community.

9. Reports for Information:

- a. Senate Executive Minutes (January 20, 2026)
- b. Strategic Visioning Session report (December 12, 2025)
- c. COU Academic Colleague Report (December 2025)
- d. UPC and TPAC Membership Report for 2026

In response to a question from Senate, the Chair explained that the Visioning Report will flow into the strategic planning process, and, along with reports from sessions with other groups, will inform the deliberations of the strategic plan working groups moving forward.

10. Other Business

None was identified.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned (P. Williams, A. Masoumi) at 4:00 pm.

Senate Question Period -- March 2026

Question from Senator Jody Mason:

Are the offices designated to receive complaints arising from the Institutional Impartiality Policy now prepared to do this work? How exactly will these offices conduct their investigations?

Senate Membership Ratifications

March 27, 2026

MOTION: That Senate ratify the following Senate appointments, as presented, for service beginning July 1, 2026.

Faculty Member Representatives (acclaimed)

- Katie Lucas, Faculty of Science
- Gabriel Wainer, Faculty of Engineering & Design
- Janine Debanné, Azrieli School of Architecture & Engineering
- Janet Mantler, Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences
- Pascal Gin, Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences
- Paul Williams, Faculty of Arts & Social Science

Student Member Representatives (acclaimed)

- Gabrielle Lachance – Science
- Nathan Bruni – Engineering & Design
- Brian Timmons – Public & Global Affairs
- Joshua Chicoine – Public & Global Affairs
- Madvan Nikhil Sewpal – Public & Global Affairs

MEMORANDUM

The Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admission and Studies Policy (SCCASP)

To: Senate
From: David Mendeloff, Chair of SCCASP
Date: March 27, 2026
Subject: Regulation Changes for Approval

Items for Approval

SCCASP has reviewed and is recommending to Senate approval of major modifications to the following regulations:

- Bachelor of Engineering Year Status Prerequisites (Faculty of Engineering and Design Undergraduate Regulations)
- University Year Standing (Program Regulation 3.1.7 of the Undergraduate Calendar)
- Graduate Admission Requirements and Eligibility (General Regulation 2 of the Graduate Calendar)
- Graduate Academic Standing (General Regulation 11 of the Graduate Calendar)
- Graduate Thesis Requirements (General Regulation 12 of the Graduate Calendar)
- Graduate Time Limits for Program Completion (General Regulation 13 of the Graduate Calendar)

The proposed changes to the Bachelor of Engineering regulations have been recommended by the Faculty of Engineering and Design Faculty Board. The proposed Graduate Regulation changes have been recommended by Graduate Council.

A summary of the changes and individual motions is below. A single omnibus motion is presented in the interest of efficiency. Senators may request to pull any of the proposed changes out of the omnibus motion for individual consideration.

Senators are encouraged to read the accompanying Courseleaf documents prior to the Senate meeting as they will be voting on the Courseleaf language as presented.

Omnibus Motion: That Senate approve the revisions to the following as presented:

- R-UG-BENG Year Status Prerequisites
- R-UG-3.1.7 University Year Standing
- R-GR-2 Admission Requirements
- R-GR-11 Academic Standing
- R-GR-12 Thesis Requirements

- R-GR-13 Time Limits

Summary of Changes and Individual Motions

1. Bachelor of Engineering Year Status Prerequisites

Removal of the Engineering-specific "year status" prerequisite requirements from the Faculty of Engineering and Design Undergraduate Regulations. Progression will now be managed through individual course prerequisites or university year standing. In addition, this change necessitates an update to Regulation 3.1.7 (University Year Standing) to remove reference to Engineering "year status".

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-UG-BENG Year Status Prerequisites and Regulations R-UG-3.1.7 University Year Standing effective for the 2026/27 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: R-UG-BENG Year Status Prerequisites and R-UG-3.1.7 University Year Standing

2. Fast-Track from Master's to Ph.D.

The addition of formal language to General Regulation 2 (Graduate Admissions Requirements and Eligibility) to permit programs to include an option to "fast-track" exceptional first-year Master's students into the corresponding Ph.D. program.

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-GR-2 Admission Requirements and Eligibility effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: R-GR-2 Admission Requirements and Eligibility

3. Graduate Student Progress Reporting

Rewording and strengthening language in General Regulation 11 of the Graduate Calendar (Graduate Academic Standing) specifying requirements for Master's and Ph.D. students around progress reporting and thesis supervision.

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-GR-11 Academic Standing effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: R-GR-11 Academic Standing

4. Manuscript-Based Thesis

Updating General Regulation 12 of the Graduate Calendar (Graduate Thesis Requirements) to clarify the expectations and requirements for an Integrated Thesis, including renaming it to "Manuscript-Based Thesis".

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-GR-12 Thesis Requirements effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: R-GR-12 Thesis Requirements

5. Regularly-Scheduled Break for Master's Students

Adding new language to General Regulation 13 of the Graduate Calendar (Time Limits for Program Completion) to clarify which Master's students are eligible for a regularly-scheduled break in the summer term.

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-GR-13 Time Limits for Program Completion effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: R-GR-13 Time Limits for Program Completion

Items for Information:

1. Minor Modifications

In addition to the major modifications presented above, SCCASP reviewed and approved minor modifications to both undergraduate and graduate courses and programs. These items are listed for Senate's review in the following attachments:

- a. UG_2627_MinorMods_2026Feb3
- b. UG_2627_Minor Mods_2026Mar3
- c. UG_2627_Minor Mods_2026Mar17
- d. GR_2627_MinorMods_2026Mar17

2. Glossary

At its last meeting, SCCASP approved changes to the Glossary to add definitions for *Accelerated Pathway*, *Advanced Entry*, *Advanced Standing*, *Direct Entry*, and *Fast-Track*. These new entries are presented for review in the following attachment:

- a. Glossary

3. 7-Year Academic Schedule

One of the responsibilities of SCCASP is to approve the undergraduate and graduate academic schedules based on the Guidelines for Determining the Academic Year established by Senate

(see attached). The schedule is approved annually for the following academic year. In addition, SCCASP approves a 7-Year Academic Schedule for longer-range planning. At its last meeting SCCASP reviewed and approved the 7-year Schedule for Academic Years 2027-2035. The approved schedule is provided for Senate's review in the following attachments:

- a. Senate Guidelines for Determining the Academic Year
- b. Master Schedule Fall 2027 to Winter 2035
- c. Master Schedule Summer 2028 to 2035

DATE: March 18, 2026

TO: Senate

FROM: Dr. David J. Hornsby, Vice-Provost (Academic and Global Learning), and Chair, Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee

RE: Calendar Curriculum Proposals
Major Modifications

Background

Following Faculty Board approval, as part of academic quality assurance, major curriculum modifications are considered by the Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC) before being recommended to Senate. Major curriculum modifications are also considered by the Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admissions and Studies Policy (SCCASP).

Library Reports (as required)

In electronic communication members of the Library staff, upon review of the proposals, confirmed no additional resources were required for the major modifications included below.

Documentation

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

Omnibus Motion

In order to expedite business with the multiple changes that are subject to Senate approval at this meeting, an omnibus motion will be moved and include all items below. Senators may wish to identify any of the major modifications that they feel warrant individual discussion that will then not be covered by the omnibus motion. Independent motions as set out below will nonetheless be written into the Senate minutes for those major modifications that Senators agree can be covered by the omnibus motion.

THAT Senate approve the major modifications as presented below.

Major Modifications

1. Infrastructure Protection and International Security

SCCASP approval: February 3, 2026

SQAPC approval: February 12, 2026

Senate Motion March 27, 2026

THAT Senate approve the closure of MENG programs, the associated modifications and the change in governance of the graduate program in Infrastructure Protection and International Security as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

2. IRM 3007 & 3009

SCCASP approval: March 3, 2026

SQAPC approval: February 12, 2026

Senate Motion March 27, 2026

THAT Senate approve the introduction of IRM 3009 & deletion of IRM 3007 as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

3. M.Sc. Physics

SCCASP approval: February 3, 2026

SQAPC approval: February 12, 2026

Senate Motion March 27, 2026

THAT Senate approve the major modification to the MSc program in Physics and the introduction of PHYS 5910 & 5911 as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

4. Technology Innovation Management

SCCASP approval: February 3, 2026

SQAPC approval: February 12, 2026

Senate Motion March 27, 2026

THAT Senate approve the major modification to the Technology Innovation Management programs as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

5. WGST 3999

SCCASP approval: February 3, 2026

SQAPC approval: February 12, 2026

Senate Motion March 27, 2026

THAT Senate approve the introduction of WGST 3999 as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

6. PSYC 5904

SCCASP approval: February 3, 2026

SQAPC approval: January 22, 2026

Senate Motion March 27, 2026

THAT Senate approve the major modification to PSYC 5904 as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

7. Minor in Integrated Science

SCCASP approval: March 3, 2026

SQAPC approval: March 12, 2026

Senate Motion March 27, 2026

THAT Senate approve the name change of the minor in Integrated Science to Interdisciplinary Science Application as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

8. PhD Information Technology

SCCASP approval: March 17, 2026

SQAPC approval: March 12, 2026

Senate Motion March 27, 2026

THAT Senate approve the major modification to the PhD in Information Technology program as presented with effect from Fall 2026.



DATE: March 18, 2026

TO: Senate

FROM: Dr. David J. Hornsby, Vice-Provost (Academic and Global Learning)

RE: Suspended program admissions – For information

Programs that have been approved to suspend admissions are being circulated to Senate for information. The requests have been made by the units, approved by the Deans and the Vice-Provost (Academic and Global Learning) and all necessary administrative steps have been taken by Admissions, the Registrar's Office and Graduate Studies.

Unless otherwise indicated, admissions to the programs will be suspended for two admission cycles. The Office of Academic Programs and Strategic Initiatives will be responsible for following up with the units to ensure appropriate action (i.e program reinstatement or closure) is taken.

Any modifications relating to program reinstatement or closure will be brought to Senate for approval.

Suspended admissions for Fall 2027 (Supporting documentation has been provided for information)

BScH Nanoscience

MEMORANDUM

From: Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC)
To: Senate
Date: March 27, 2026
Subject: Senate Question Period Guidelines

SAGC has reviewed the feedback received from Senators on the Question Period Guidelines, and has made the following adjustments to the document:

- Point #1 – SAGC adjusted the language to mirror that of the Academic Governance of the University (AGU). Since the AGU states that “up to one-half hour of the Senate meeting is devoted to [Question Period]”, the Guidelines have been updated to avoid creating any inconsistency with this provision.
- Point #5 – A sentence was added to confirm that Senators will be notified when their questions are not approved for inclusion in the Senate binder.
- Point #6 has been expanded to clarify how the order of questions in the binder is determined, and point #9, the procedure for questions not addressed at Senate due to lack of time, has been moved here as 6-c.
- The chart outlining examples of topics inside and outside the purview of Senate has been removed.

MOTION: That Senate adopt the Senate Question Period Guidelines, as presented.

Carleton University Senate

Question Period Guidelines

- 1) A Question Period shall be held at each regular meeting of Senate (open session). Up to thirty minutes shall be devoted to the Question Period, in accordance with Section 5.2.4 of the Academic Governance of the University (AGU).
- 2) The purpose of the Question Period is to provide Senators with an opportunity to raise questions or seek clarification on matters within the purview of Senate.
- 3) Only current Senators may submit questions. All questions must fall within the purview of Senate, as defined in [Section 2.1 of the Academic Governance of the University \(AGU\)](#).
- 4) Questions must be submitted in writing to the Senate Office no later than two weeks prior to the Senate meeting at which they are to be considered.
- 5) The Senate Executive Committee shall determine whether submitted questions fall within the purview of Senate.
 - a. Questions deemed in scope will be approved for inclusion in the Senate binder, unless otherwise addressed on the agenda.
 - b. The Committee may request revisions to clarify the intent or wording of a question.
 - c. Questions determined to be outside the purview of Senate normally will be redirected to the appropriate unit on campus for a response. Senators whose questions are not approved to be included in the Senate binder will be notified, and will be informed of the reason for the decision.
- 6) Questions approved by the Senate Executive Committee will be circulated in the Senate binder along with other meeting materials, one week prior to the Senate meeting.
 - a. Questions addressing the same or similar topics may be grouped or consolidated for a single response.

Deleted: The Question Period shall not exceed thirty minutes.

Deleted: may

Deleted: Approved questions

- b. Questions normally will be addressed in the order received.
- c. Any questions included in the Senate binder but not addressed during the Senate meeting due to time constraints will automatically be carried forward to the Question Period of the next Senate meeting (open session).
- d. Time-sensitive questions may be prioritized in the order of questions.

- 7) Responses to the questions are generally provided at the Senate meeting. Respondents may alternatively provide a written response in advance for inclusion in the Senate binder.
- 8) Follow-up questions during the Senate meeting are permitted at the discretion of the Chair and are subject to time limitations.

Document Origin Date: *March 27, 2026*

Commented [KM1]: The order of c and d has been reversed.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 2.54 cm, No bullets or numbering

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: <#>Any approved questions included in the Senate binder but not addressed during the Senate meeting due to time constraints will automatically be carried forward to the Question Period of the next Senate meeting (open session). ¶
Examples of Topics Within and Outside the Purview of Senate (for Question Period)
(non-exhaustive list)¶
Within the Purview of Senate¶
(Academic Governance)

... [1]

AI FRAMEWORK FOR CARLETON UNIVERSITY

March 18, 2026

Background

When Generative Artificial intelligence (GenAI) became widely available in 2022¹, Carleton University, like other post-secondary institutions, began exploring its implications for education. In early 2023, the provost convened a working group, chaired by the vice-provost (academic and global learning). This group developed early [guidelines and recommendations on the use of GenAI within teaching and learning](#) for Carleton's community. The working group considered both the opportunities and challenges brought on by GenAI, including academic integrity, ethical, and privacy concerns. As [AI technologies](#) continue to develop and become more common, the university began to consider the implications of the technology on research and administrative work.

This framework aims to build on and extend the university's earlier work. It draws from a variety of additional resources: The [University of Saskatchewan's AI Principles and Guidelines Revised](#), [the Australian Framework for AI in Higher Education](#), the Higher Education Strategy Associates' (HESA) [AI Observatory](#), [a humanistic architecture for AI](#) by Paul Tiyambe Zeleza, and both academic and non-academic publications in the post-secondary sector.

The Office of the vice-provost (academic and global learning) led the development of the initial draft Framework, which was shared with several groups to gather feedback:

- Offices of deans and vice-presidents
- The Digital Steering Committee
- The university's Working Group on AI in Teaching and Learning
- FASS Faculty Board
- The Office of the associate vice-president (Indigenous teaching, learning, and research)
- Carleton University Academic Staff Association (CUASA)
- The Student Government

Meanwhile, Carleton's students, faculty, and staff were invited and encouraged to provide their feedback via an online form that was open and promoted from November 2025 to February 2026.

This Framework, shaped by the feedback collected, is not a policy or governance document. Rather, it is intended to support the Carleton community by providing general principles and guidance. It is a living document, and implementation guidance will evolve over time. Any future institutional AI policies will be informed by these general principles. As the university gains experience with AI, the implementation guidance will be routinely reviewed and updated.

¹ Open AI released ChatGPT to the public in November 2022.

Opportunities & Challenges

AI is affecting the way we work, learn, teach, research, and complete operational and administrative tasks. Many of the tools we rely on, such as document and spreadsheet applications, image editors, learning management systems (LMS), and research databases, already include various AI features that the university often cannot disable.

The university acknowledges the various valid concerns surrounding the negative effects of AI, including but not limited to those on the environment, jobs, mental health, intellectual property, data sovereignty, and academic integrity (Cotton et al., 2024; Crawford, 2021). If used improperly, AI has been shown to hinder cognitive skills, especially for novice learners (Grassini, 2023; Habib et al., 2024; Lin, 2025). Additionally, there is a growing concern that the adoption of AI could have lasting effects on important human traits like empathy, social and emotional intelligence, complex thinking, the ability to act independently, and sense of purpose (Anderson & Rainie, 2025).

Notwithstanding, the university must also recognize the potential AI has to support effective teaching practices, deepen learning experiences, foster innovation (Mollick & Mollick, 2023; Mucharraz y Cano, Venuti, & Herrera Martinez, 2023; UNESCO, 2023), enhance accessibility for people with disabilities (Zhao, Cox, & Chen, 2025), and make administrative work more efficient (Al Naqbi et al., 2024). As AI reshapes what we recognize as knowledge, how students engage with learning, and what institutions can credibly verify, AI governance and AI literacy become necessary (Zezeza, 2025).

In this context, the university must act intentionally by promoting critical AI literacy within our community and strategically integrating AI technologies where and when appropriate. In doing so, the appropriate AI use will vary across disciplines and university functions (teaching, learning, research, operations/ administration). AI integrations and adoptions should not impose uniform models that conflict with disciplinary and functional norms. Any use of AI needs to consider significant differences in how it can affect novices in the discipline field versus experts, between low- and high-risk AI use cases, and the distinction between AI literacy and AI operational fluency (Rogers & Carbonaro, 2025; Digital Education Council, 2025).

Faculty members retain authority over pedagogical and scholarly judgment within their courses and research programs. Faculty members can choose not to engage with AI at all if they prefer.

At the same time, the university is committed to encouraging innovation and will continue to support faculty members as they try to integrate the proper and effective use of AI in their teaching.

Purpose & Scope

This Framework provides guidance on the use of AI at Carleton University, ensuring that academics, staff, and students are equipped with the knowledge and skills needed to use AI technologies effectively, responsibly, and ethically. It imposes no obligations on university community members; however, its general principles may inform the development of university AI policies and processes in the future.

The Framework aligns with Carleton’s strategic priorities, Indigenous knowledge systems as outlined in Kinàmàgawin Calls to Action, Indigenous Data Sovereignty in Research, the Coordinated Accessibility Strategy, the EDI Action Plan, and global ethical AI frameworks such as:

- Frameworks set forth by [federal](#) and [provincial](#) governments
- First Nations Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession (OCAP) Principles.
- First Nations and AI, Chiefs of Ontario
- Global Indigenous Data Alliance CARE Principles (collective benefit, authority to control, responsibility, and ethics)
- [OECD AI Principles](#), and
- [UNESCO’s Ethics of AI](#).

The Framework does not substantially address academic integrity. Instead, readers should refer to existing resources, including [guidelines and recommendations about the use of AI in teaching and learning](#) report by the Working Group on AI in Teaching and Learning and the university’s [AI website](#).

Definitions

This Framework uses the general term “artificial intelligence (AI)” in recognition that AI will continue to develop beyond its current types like generative and agentic AI. It also uses UNESCO’s definition² of AI; that is, “systems which have the capacity to process data and information in a way that resembles intelligent behaviour, and typically includes aspects of reasoning, learning, perception, prediction, planning or control.” AI can take many forms, such as adaptive learning systems, chatbots, predictive analytics, accessibility tools, and immersive technologies including augmented and virtual reality (B.C. Post-secondary ethical educational technology toolkit, 2025).

Agentic Artificial Intelligence is a form of artificial intelligence developed to operate autonomously, making its own decisions and taking actions with minimal or no human intervention to achieve specific goals (e.g., Perplexity Comet).

AI Literacy³ refers to the knowledge and skills needed to understand, interact with, and critically evaluate AI technologies. It includes knowing how to use AI ethically, understanding both positive and negative impact associated with AI, questioning and

² UNESCO (2021). Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence.

³ Digital Education Council (2025). AI literacy framework.

evaluating AI output, and adapting to the changing AI landscape in both personal and professional settings.

AI Technical Proficiency or **Operational Fluency** is the knowledge and skill needed to effectively use AI technologies, software, and functionalities.

Generative AI (GenAI)⁴ is a subset of AI that can generate new content in response to a user's prompt, such as text, images, audio, and code, based on patterns learned from its training data.

Large Language Models (LLMs) are machine learning models trained on large text datasets to learn patterns in language, enabling them to generate, transform, and analyze text through probabilistic prediction.

Machine Learning⁵ is a subfield of AI that focuses on enabling computer systems to learn from data by training algorithms on historical data to observe patterns and make predictions or decisions.

Predictive AI⁶ combines traditional statistical methods with machine learning algorithms to find data patterns, analyze them and forecast future outcomes.

Guiding Principles

1. Creativity & Innovation

Carleton is dedicated to continuous improvement, lifelong learning, and inclusivity. The university strives to create a campus experience that is forward-thinking and responsive to the evolving needs of our community and society at large. To this end, the university aims to foster a safe and supportive environment where academics, staff, and students can explore and experiment with AI technology and voice their concerns about the use of AI.

1.1 Literate & Empowered

- Use AI to support creativity and innovation, not replace it.
- Develop critical AI literacy across all roles at the university.
- Encourage experimentation and ongoing learning.
- Examine the potential of developing AI models based on Indigenous knowledge.

1.2 Purposeful & Aligned

- Integrate AI only where it enhances learning, work, or insight.
- Ensure that AI use is tied to authentic and outcome-driven goals.
- Link the use of AI to Truth and Reconciliation.

⁴ Stryker, C. & Scapicchio, M. (unknown), IBM.

⁵ [Bergmann, D. \(unknown\), IBM](#)

⁶ [Caballar, R. D. \(unknown\), IBM.](#)

2. Responsible & Ethical Use

Carleton's employees and students will utilize AI technologies in ways that are fair and equitable, while protecting private and sensitive data, and minimizing the risk of harm. The university will promote AI literacy so that students, educators, and staff can engage critically with AI technologies that are always in service of learning and human growth.

The university will not use AI to reproduce, distribute, or monetarize the image, voice, or professional and academic work of faculty members and students without their explicit authorization. The same applies to the use of AI to reproduce the image and voice of professional staff members.

2.1 Inclusive & Equitable

- Prioritize equity, accessibility, and diverse epistemologies.
- Consider Indigenous ways of knowing in assessing AI.
- Learn about and challenge AI-generated bias.
- Consider the environmental impact of AI technologies within Carleton-adopted systems during the procurement process, with the aim of reduction and alignment with the university's sustainability goals, as well as with the university's purpose to serve the public interest.

2.2 Privacy-Respecting & Secure

- Use only Carleton-approved tools for confidential, sensitive, and institutional data.
- Recognize and respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples to control and protect Indigenous data and knowledge.
- Uphold privacy and academic integrity standards.
- Never use AI for surveillance.

3. Human Agency & Transparency

AI is a supplementary technology and should never replace human decision-making. Humans remain responsible and accountable for all aspects of their work: academics are responsible for the integrity of their research projects, course design, and the assessment and evaluation of their learners; students are responsible for learning honestly, authentically, and with integrity, as outlined by Carleton's Academic Integrity Policy; and staff are responsible for the accuracy and impact of their work and decisions.

Decisions about admission to programs, hiring, tenure and promotion, and any other situations where a person is being evaluated must be made by humans and therefore cannot rely solely on AI.

3.1 Human-Centered & Responsible

- People - not AI - are responsible for the outcomes of research, teaching, learning, and operations.

- Maintain human judgment in feedback, research, teaching, learning, and decision-making.
- Respect the right to opt out of AI use.
- Respect academic freedom and all provisions of collective agreements for faculty, staff, contract instructors, and teaching assistants.

3.2 Transparent & Explainable

- Disclose the use of AI clearly and explain how and why it was applied.
- Foster an open and reflective culture around AI engagement.

The principles outlined above apply to the broader university community, including academics, students, student-employees, professional staff, contractors, and service partners. These principles are reflected across all areas of the university through distinct responsibilities in research, teaching, learning, and administration.

Implementation Guidelines

Implications of AI require the university to adjust its policies and processes, and create a practical set of guidelines, including setting limits on AI (Zezeza, 2025). The following guidelines are intended for faculty members, students, and staff who choose to use AI in their university-related work.

Teaching

- Make expectations for AI use clear in the course outline and discuss them early in the term, with reinforcement as required.
- Use AI to support pedagogical goals, not replace human interaction.
- Help students think about the impact of AI on the relevant discipline or field of study.
- Design assessments that encourage authentic work and reflection on AI.
- Foster conversations about AI's role in learning and society, including adverse effects on environment, mental health, biases, privacy, misinformation, and the impact of AI algorithmic biases.
- Embed AI competencies in teaching activities and materials where appropriate to prepare graduates for the use of AI and the interpretation of AI-generated outputs beyond university.
- Balance developing learners' creative and critical thinking skills with the use of AI.
- Contextualize AI activities to highlight the importance of human skills and creativity.
- Help students develop mindful habits around AI to maintain a balanced relationship with digital tools.

- Ensure AI-enabled technologies and activities are accessible to all students, including those using adaptive technologies.
- Ensure the final evaluation of students' work is always done by the course instructor, especially if AI was used to assist with grading.

Curriculum

- Regularly review and update programs and courses to reflect the evolving impact of AI on disciplines, careers, and society.
- Critically assess the relevance of program-level outcomes to ensure alignment with employment trends, evolving skill sets, employer expectations, and technological advancements.
- Integrate AI-related competencies and skills, such as ethical reasoning, critical evaluation, and data literacy, across curricula to ensure our graduates are equipped for the future. Integrating AI competences should account for variability in learner needs.
- Include accessibility implications and the experience of disabled people in curriculum discussions about AI ethics.
- Enhance the students' awareness of issues such as copyright, rights to privacy, data sovereignty, and Indigenous data sovereignty.
- Leverage Carleton's commitment to interdisciplinarity by fostering collaboration and integration across programs to bolster AI literacy and to help students navigate AI's ethical, societal, and technical dimensions.
- Actively involve program and university stakeholders (e.g., students, academics, alums, and industry) in the curriculum renewal process to ensure graduates are well-prepared to meet current and emerging job market demands.

Learning

- Use AI as a learning aid, not as a means to shortcut the learning process.
- Reflect honestly on how AI impacts your learning and seek help when unsure about the use of AI.
- Learn how to critically evaluate AI outputs and develop critical understanding of the ethical and legal implications of inputs used to train LLMs.
- Learn about Indigenous data sovereignty principles and Indigenous AI models.
- Follow the rules and guidelines about AI use in the course outline and as laid out by the course instructor. Seek guidance and instruction from the course instructor about AI use when expectations are not clear before engaging with AI for course work.
- Safeguard your private information and do not share it with AI models. This can be achieved by using AI technologies that have been adopted by Carleton and have passed an internal Data Privacy and Risk Assessment review.
- Review the Academic Integrity Policy and your responsibilities and ask questions when you are uncertain about academic-related behaviours.
- Verify the information provided by AI with other sources and use it as a supplement rather than a replacement for traditional search methods.

- Acknowledge any and all use of AI through citations and AI disclosure statements.

Research

- When appropriate, leverage AI technologies to explore ideas, inform hypotheses, process information, generate summaries, or assist with drafting grant applications.
- Respect Indigenous data sovereignty principles, and Indigenous AI guiding ethics and protocols.
- Recognize and acknowledge that AI technologies are inherently biased.
- Validate AI outputs and remain accountable for research accuracy.
- Ensure confidential or sensitive research data is used only with Carleton University approved tools.
- Disclose AI use when drafting manuscripts, literature reviews, or data summaries.
- Consult and follow the guidelines on AI use and disclosure provided by journals, funding agencies, and professional associations.
- Update policies for AI-assisted research.

Operations & Administration

- Use AI to streamline repetitive tasks (e.g., summarizing, drafting, data analysis), provided such tasks would not result in the disclosure of sensitive or confidential information.
- Ensure accessibility criteria guide the adoption of automation across the university.
- Protect institutional and sensitive data and use only technologies approved by the university for work-related information.
- Promote human-centered automation that supports rather than replaces human judgment.
- Always check the accuracy of AI output and ensure human oversight for any AI-generated content.
- Disclose and document use of AI in university records, consistent with best practices and guidelines by Records Management and Corporate Archives.
- Become familiar and follow the process of approving new AI technologies by Carleton's ITS. Recognize that all new software needs to have a Privacy Impact Assessment and Digital Protection Risk Assessment completed, as legislated for all public institutions.
- At the department level, define and document for staff those materials that should not be entered into AI systems.
- If you are uncertain about the appropriateness of AI use, consult your managers and departmental leads for guidance.
- Learn about AI technology.

Carleton University Leadership

- Ensure that cybersecurity and data governance protocols, along with AI guidance and considerations are updated regularly to reflect advancements in AI.
- Proactively engage with stakeholders from a change and communications perspective (e.g., employees, unions, management, students, governance groups) to ensure alignment on the use of AI across the university.
- Encourage consistent, university-wide communication and guidance regarding AI.
- Explore developing and implementing a course on AI literacy for all incoming first-year students.
- Explore creating Carleton's own AI-based technology for streamlining administrative processes while ensuring that all Carleton's data are protected and kept locally.
- Ensure considerations of legislation and regulations related to AI use (e.g., Bill 194: Strengthening Cybersecurity and Building Trust in the Public Sector Act, 2024).
- Ensure that financial and other resources are available to support AI activities on campus, including building AI literacy, professional development opportunities for employees, centralized support, training, and consultation resources for staff, faculty, contract instructors, teaching assistants, and community members who experiment and or adopt AI in their work.
- Encourage the development and innovation of Indigenous AI and Indigenous AI-related research.
- Encourage research about AI and its impacts, including research that exposes and examines AI bias and develops means of reducing such bias.
- Ensure collective agreements with staff, faculty, librarians, contract instructors and teaching assistants are respected and protection measures are taken in situations where AI may impact employees.
- Explore opportunities to collaborate with Ottawa's other post-secondary institutions (e.g., La Cite, Algonquin, Ottawa U) on the co-construction and management of a shared data centre, cloud system, and compute resources.
- Monitor the development and implementation of AI initiatives across the university's functions (e.g., teaching, learning, research, operations, and administration). Consult with the campus community to identify potential gaps, critically assess AI use and its effects, and recommend appropriate actions.

Immediate Next Steps

The Senior Management Policy Committee should work with all relevant stakeholders to update or develop relevant institutional policies to address issues such as acceptable use of AI, academic integrity, AI-related procurement standards, AI-related research, and other relevant policies.

Information Technology Services (ITS) should establish a clear process for vetting AI features, with a simplified and quick process for those posing a low-

level risk. ITS should collaborate with Human Resources, privacy and legal offices, and operational units to assess opportunities and risks in administrative automation.

Human Resources, in collaboration with ITS and other relevant units, should develop training for professional staff and managers, including training on responsible AI use in administrative tasks.

Teaching and Learning Services, the Library, and Student Academic Support Services should expand their workshops and resources on AI-enabled teaching, student AI literacy, and AI use in research.

Coordinate among the Office of the Vice-President (Research), CORIS, IPS, Post Awards, research computing, ethics boards, and library services to address AI use in research workflows, data governance, and compliance with funder and journal policies.

Governance

The Working Group on AI in Teaching and Learning will broaden its mandate and membership to become the cross-functional AI Advisory Group. This group already brings together representatives from academic leadership, IT, the Library, faculty members representing all Faculties, student representatives, and TLS. Adding members from the privacy, legal, and research offices will allow the group to better serve as the operational forum for evaluating and coordinating AI-related issues before decisions move through existing governance structures.

The AI Advisory Group will work closely with the Teaching and Learning Technology Committee (TLTC), the Research Computing Committee (RCC), the Administrative Computing Committee (ACC), and the Data Administration Working Group (DAWG) on AI-related matters.

The AI Advisory Group will also regularly inform the Senate and the Carleton University Academic Staff Association (CUASA) about new AI developments that could impact academic matters.

References

- Al Naqbi, H., Bahroun, Z., & Ahmed, V. (2024). Enhancing work productivity through generative AI: A comprehensive literature review. *Sustainability* 16(3), p. 1166. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16031166>
- Anderson, J. & Rainie, L. (2025). Expert views on the impact of AI on the essence of being human. Elon University's Imagining the Digital Future Center. <https://imaginingthedigitalfuture.org/reports-and-publications/being-human-in-2035>
- Bergmann, D. (unknown). [What is Machine Learning? | IBM](#)
- British Columbia, Ministry of Post-Secondary Education and Future Skills (2025). B.C. post-secondary ethical educational technology toolkit. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/post-secondary-education/institution-resources-administration/digital-learning-strategy/bc_post-secondary_ethical_educational_technology_toolkit.pdf
- Caballar, R. D. (unknown). [Generative AI vs. predictive AI: What's the difference? | IBM](#)
- Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P.A., J.R. Shipway, J.R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61 (2) (2024), pp. 228-239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. Yale University Press.
- Digital Education Council (2025). AI literacy framework. <https://www.digitaleducationcouncil.com/post/digital-education-council-ai-literacy-framework>
- Grassini, S. (2023). Shaping the future of education: Exploring the potential and consequences of AI and ChatGPT in educational settings. *Education in Science*, 13 (7) (2023), p. 692. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070692>
- HESA (updated 2025). Observatory on AI policies in Canadian post-secondary education. <https://higheredstrategy.com/ai-observatory-home>
- Habib, S., Vogel, T., Anli, X, & Thorne, E. (2024). How does generative artificial intelligence impact student creativity? *Journal of Creativity*, 34 (1) (2024) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yjoc.2023.100072>
- Lodge, J. L., Lodge M., Bower M., Gulson, K., Henderson, M., Slade, C., & Southgate E. (2025). Australian framework for Artificial Intelligence in higher education.

<https://www.acses.edu.au/publication/australian-framework-for-artificial-intelligence-in-higher-education>

Mollick, E., & Mollick, L. (2023). Why all our classes suddenly became AI classes: Strategies for teaching and learning in a ChatGPT world. *Harvard Business Publishing – Education*. <https://hbsp.harvard.edu/inspiring-minds/why-all-our-classes-suddenly-became-ai-classes>

Mucharraz y C., Venuti, F., & Herrera Martinez, R. (2023). ChatGPT and AI text generators: Should academia adapt or resist? *Harvard Business Publishing – Education*. <https://hbsp.harvard.edu/inspiring-minds/chatgpt-and-ai-text-generators-should-academia-adapt-or-resist>

Rogers, T., & Carbonaro, M. (2025). From understanding to creating: bridging AI literacy and AI fluency in K-12 education. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 19, No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v19i4.9420>

Stryker, C. (unknown). [What are Large Language Models \(LLMs\)? | IBM](#).

Stryker, C. & Scapicchio, M. (unknown). [What is Generative AI? | IBM](#).

UNESCO (2023). ChatGPT and AI in higher education: Quick start guide. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000385146>

UNESCO (2021). Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380455>

University of Saskatchewan (2025). USak's Artificial Intelligence (AI) principles and guidelines revised. <https://ai.usask.ca/documents/artificial-intelligence-principles.pdf>

Zezeza, P. T. (2025). [AI as a humanistic system: Frameworks for meaning, power, and governance](#). Substack.

Zhao, X., Cox, A., & Chen, X. (2025). The use of generative AI by students with disabilities in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2025.101014>



Senate Executive Committee
February 17, 2026
TB503C + TEAMS videoconference

MINUTES

Attending: R. Dansereau (Clerk), N. Hagigi, A. Hurrelmann, G. Lacroix, P. Rankin, R. Renfro, W. Tettey (Chair)

Regrets: Z. Al Attar, D. Hornsby

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

1. Welcome & Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 11:07 am.

It was **MOVED** (P. Rankin, R. Dansereau) that the agenda of the meeting of the Senate Executive Committee on February 17, 2026 be approved, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

2. Approval of Senate Executive Committee Minutes (January 20, 2026)

It was **MOVED** (A. Hurrelmann, N. Hagigi) that the Senate Executive Committee approve the minutes of the Senate Executive Committee meeting on January 20, 2026 as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

3. Review of Senate Minutes (January 30, 2026)

The minutes of the Senate meeting on January 30, 2026 were circulated in advance. A few minor editorial changes were identified.

4. Draft Senate Agenda – February 27, 2026

A draft Senate agenda for the February 27th meeting was circulated to Senate Executive members in advance.

It was **MOVED** (G. Lacroix, R. Dansereau) that the Senate Executive Committee approve the agenda for the Senate meeting of February 27, 2026 as presented.

Committee members were asked to remove the SQAPC Report from the agenda, and to add the COU Academic Colleague Report and the Report on UPC and TPAC membership to the Reports for Information.

With these changes made, the motion to approve the agenda as amended **PASSED**.

5. Question Period Guidelines

The Clerk of Senate introduced this item to committee members. Senate Question Period is a standard item included at the beginning of the Senate agenda. Senators are invited to submit questions in advance of the Senate meeting, and to have those questions included in the meeting binder, then answered at Senate.

The AGU specifies that up to 30 minutes can be used for this item, but Question Period often exceeds this time limit, and questions submitted often are not in the purview of Senate. To address these issues, the Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC) has drafted a set of guidelines clarifying the purpose, scope, and procedures associated with Question Period. Additionally, SAGC is proposing that the responsibility for reviewing submitted questions be transferred from the Chair of Senate, Clerk and Secretariat staff, to the Senate Executive Committee, which would reinforce an open and transparent process. The Guidelines also include a table listing topics that are within and outside the purview of Senate.

Some members felt that the table may be too restrictive, noting that topics outside the normal purview of Senate (for example, the budget) are regularly discussed at Senate meetings. After some discussion, committee members decided to keep the table with a few content tweaks, and the addition of some nuanced language in the document and memo for Senate.

6. Revised Senate Executive Committee Terms of Reference

The Clerk presented a revised Senate Executive Committee Terms of Reference to the committee for review and discussion. The Senate Academic Governance Committee is

proposing numerous changes to the TOR to align it with current practice, to incorporate Senate Executive's two enduring empowering motions into the TOR, and to add the responsibility for reviewing questions for Senate Question Period. Senate Executive Committee members endorsed, by consensus, the revised TOR.

7. Other Business

No other business was identified.

8. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned (A. Hurrelmann, N. Hagigi) at 11:49 am.



Office of the Dean
Faculty of Public and Global Affairs
D391 Loeb Building
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON Canada, K1S 5B6
Tel: (613) 520-3741
Fax: (613) 520-3742
www.carleton.ca/fpga

March 10, 2026

Report of the Academic Colleague from Council of Ontario University Meetings
February 10 and 11, 2026

Colleagues,

I am pleased to provide to Senate a report from the meeting of Ontario University Academic Colleagues with the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) held on February 10 and 11, 2026. These notes were prepared by the COU Secretariat.

Just for context, the meetings were held several days prior to the Ontario government's announcement about new funding.

Paul Wilson, Ph.D.
Associate Dean (Students and Enrolment), Faculty of Public and Global Affairs
Associate Professor, Riddell Graduate Program in Political Management

Academic Colleagues

February 10-11, 2026

Meeting Notes

Evening meeting, February 10, 2026, 6:00 to 8:30 pm

Land Acknowledgement

The Land Acknowledgment was provided by Robyn Ruttenberg-Rozen, Ontario Tech.

Outline of COU Paper on the Future of Postsecondary Education

COU President and CEO Steve Orsini joined the meeting to deliver an advocacy update and discuss and seek input on the outline of COU's draft paper on the Future of Postsecondary Education. Highlights of the presentation were as follows:

The COU President's presentation to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs in January was positively received and elicited substantial earned media coverage.

COU is working to develop a university-driven vision for the future in the context of various discussions and work underway on this topic by external organizations like the Business + Higher Education Roundtable (BHER) and Higher Education Strategy Associates (HESA).

An outline of a paper was developed in collaboration with the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV). The purpose of the paper, when finalized, will be to help guide internal discussions on what the future of higher education could look like and to support member participation in national dialogues.

The paper will address the need for Ontario's postsecondary sector to evolve amid varying global pressures including AI and emerging technologies, globalization and geopolitics, economic transformation, social change and civic renewal, and climate change

It will also highlight that universities drive talent, research and economic prosperity, and make major contributions to civil society.

Key priorities include modernizing learning (e.g. redefining lifelong learning, AI-enabled teaching and assessment, future-ready skills), expanding work-integrated learning, strengthening research and industry partnerships, improving student supports, and innovating sustainability.

The paper will also highlight that the financial sustainability of universities is a precursor to transformation, and that fostering Canada's competitiveness requires engagement from universities, different levels of government, and industry and community partners.

Following the presentation, Colleagues participated in an engaged discussion, with comments shared about the theme of sustainability in the outline, the role of AI and its impact on the future

of the sector, and the critical value of universities as sites of research and meeting places for community and shared purposes.

Colleagues Meeting, February 11, 2026, 9:00 am to 12:00 noon

Information Sharing

Colleagues shared updates on key priorities and activities at their respective institutions.

Topics for future meetings

The following topics will be added to the shared document on the COU Member Portal that Colleagues can refer and add to in between meetings:

Accommodations and inclusionary practices for teaching,

Future and pedagogical standards of online learning, and

Practices around external reviews in universities.

Quality Assurance Update

Chris Evans, Executive Director, and Cindy Robinson, Director of Operations, Quality Assurance Secretariat, delivered a presentation which covered the role and importance of quality assurance at Ontario's universities and the key elements of the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF). In the discussion that followed, Colleagues shared comments on the timelines for new program approvals and the administrative workload associated with QAF requirements.

Upcoming meetings

Academic Colleagues: Tuesday, April 14, 6:00 to 8:30 pm, and Wednesday, April 15, 9:00 am to 12:00 noon (hybrid)

- Land acknowledgement: Sue McCracken, McMaster

Members: Thursday, April 16, 12:30 to 2:30 pm (virtual)

