

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.