



*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  
PK608**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** A. Abdou, B. Appel Kuzmarov (acting for R. Goubran), D. Amundsen, J. Armstrong, S. Blanchard, A. Bordeleau, A. Bowker, F. Brouard, I. Bumagin, S. Burges, A. Butler, R. Dansereau (Clerk), M. DeRosa, J. Drake, S. Duncan, A. El-Roby, M. El Sayed, M. Francoli, K. Graham, J. Greenberg, N. Hagigi, S. Hawkins, X. Haziza, D. Hornsby, J. Jiménez Garcia, I. Knezevic, G. Lachance, G. Lacroix, N. Laporte, T. Lewis L. Madokoro, J. Mason, D. McNair, D. Mendeloff, R. Miller, M. Mullally, H. Nemiroff, K. Nyediin Buoy, P. Rankin, M. Rivers-Moore, R. Renfro, M. Rooney, C. Ruiz-Martin, A. Shotwell, B. Tackaberry, N. Tait, W. Tettey (Chair), C. Trudel, S. Viel, G. Wainer, P. Williams, P. Wilson, W. Ye

**Regrets:** I. Alma, M. Bahran, J. Brunet, N. Bruni, J. P. Corriveau, J. Debanné, E. Gray, H. Hefzy, A. Hurrelmann, B. MacLeod, G. Maracle, A. Masoumi, M. Papineau, S. Sadaf, R. Tfaily,

**Absent:** M. Agha, A. Arya, T. Davidson, N. Giroux-Laplante, E. Harlan, S. Joe-Ezigbo, A. Kocsis, K. Patel, E. Peirce, T. Turbat, M. Vatankhah

**Recording Secretary:** K. McKinley

---

**1.** The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm. The Chair began the meeting, acknowledging the passing of the following members of the Carleton community:

- Dr. Tony Bailetti, from the Sprott School of Business. Dr. Bailetti served Carleton for 47 years as professor, mentor and leader of the Technology Innovation Management program.
- Dr. Brian Mortimer, who devoted more than three decades to Carleton serving in key leadership roles including Associate Vice-President (Academic), Clerk of Senate, and Marshal of Convocation.

The Chair offered condolences to friends, family and colleagues of Dr. Bailetti and Dr. Mortimer.

Following a reminder on meeting procedures, the Chair turned to the proposed agenda for the meeting.

It was **MOVED** (P. Williams, G. Wainer) that Senate approve the agenda for the meeting of Senate on March 27, 2026, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

## **2. Minutes: February 27, 2026 (open session)**

It was **MOVED** (R. Renfroe, D. Amundsen) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting on February 27, 2026, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

## **3. Matters Arising**

The Clerk spoke to a matter arising from a response provided at the Question Period of the last Senate meeting. He reported that the revised Academic Integrity Policy was sent to the relevant stakeholders on March 16, with feedback expected by April 3<sup>rd</sup>. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Academic Integrity Policy has advised that the committee will review the feedback, then will report to Senate.

## **4. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair began his remarks by congratulating the Carleton Ravens Men's Basketball team for winning their 18<sup>th</sup> U SPORTS national championship earlier in March. This win marks the most national titles ever held by a Canadian university basketball team. A special event celebrating their victory was held on March 24, with many proud Raven fans in attendance. Senators provided a round of applause in appreciation.

The Chair next provided the following research achievement highlights:

- Carleton Professor Kate Marczenko has been awarded the John Charles Polanyi Prize in Chemistry for her impactful work in advanced functional materials and crystalline systems.

- A team of researchers led by Professor Halim Yanikomeroglu have secured funding through the Canada Foundation for Innovation to support a \$13.5M national initiative to advance non-terrestrial networks, the next major frontier in mobile connectivity. Several institutions are participating in this project; Carleton's team includes Jie Gao from the School of Information Technology and Senator Winnie Ye, from the Department of Electronics.
- Professor Hillary Maddin and her team have discovered the earliest fossil evidence of prolonged postnatal care in a vertebrate. This predates the previous oldest record of this behavior by 40 million years.

The Chair next spoke to recent initiatives to establish Carleton as a partner of choice nationally and internationally:

- In February, President Tettey joined a Universities Canada delegation to India, to deepen research and teaching partnerships, expand global learning pathways for students, and strengthen people-to-people ties in areas that matter, from innovation and skills to sustainability and inclusive growth. Following that trip, Carleton welcomed the New High Commissioner of India to Carleton to continue to build on this relationship.
- Carleton also recently hosted the Higher Education Defence Research Roundtable, focussing on how universities can contribute to civil defence, workforce preparedness and cross-sector collaboration. The event included a session to explore concrete opportunities for Carleton researchers in this rapidly evolving sector.

Finally, the Chair concluded his remarks by reporting that Carleton has once again been named one of the National Capital Region's Top Employers, for the twelfth consecutive year. This reflects Carleton's continued commitment to employee wellness, professional development, and an inclusive workplace.

## 5. Question Period

One question was submitted in advance by Senator Jody Mason.

### 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?

*The Chair recognized General Counsel Richard Sinclair, who provided a response: Offices highlighted in the policy are not specific to the Institutional Impartiality Policy but are centralized channels set up to receive complaints generally, from a number of different sources. The intake office for faculty members is Labour Relations in the Deputy Provost's Office and for professional services staff the office would be Human Resources. There is no prescribed path in this policy for dealing with complaints, as there are in other policies such as the Sexual Violence Policy. The complaints are assessed on a case-by-case basis before a decision is made on how to proceed. At this point, the existing architecture is capable of managing the process, although future refinements may occur, if needed.*

## **6. Administration**

- **Senate Membership Ratification**

The Clerk presented a motion to ratify 6 faculty members and 5 students to Senate, for terms beginning July 1, 2026. The Clerk noted one error in the motion; Senator Janine Debanné's unit should be listed as the Azrieli School of Architecture and Urbanism.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, A. Bowker) that Senate ratify the new Senate appointments, as presented, for service beginning July 1, 2026.

The motion **PASSED**.

The Clerk noted that several vacancies for faculty members and students remain on Senate and Senate Standing committees. Details are available on the Senate website.

The Clerk also encouraged all Senators to respond to the annual Senate Survey to provide valuable feedback on their experiences as a Senator to the Senate Office. The survey will be released in April.

In response to a question related to accommodation and potential attendance issues at Senate, the Recording Secretary agreed to bring a report on Senate meeting attendance records to the next Senate meeting under Matters Arising.

## 7. Reports

- **Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admissions and Studies Policy (SCCASP)**

Committee Chair David Mendeloff presented 6 items for approval and 8 items for information. The items for approval were combined into an omnibus motion for efficiency.

Items for approval – Omnibus motion

It was **MOVED** (D. Mendeloff, D. Hornsby) 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-HR-13 Time Limits

A Senator asked about the motion to fast-track graduate students into the PhD program (R-GR-2), and what provisions are in place for students in that group who then do not finish their PhD. The Chair recognized Vice-Provost (Graduate Studies) Dan Siddiqi, who reported that students with this advanced standing are provided with the opportunity to return to and finish their Master's degree.

The motion **PASSED**.

Individual motions from the Omnibus:

- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulation R-UG-BENG Year Status Prerequisites and Regulations R-UG-3.2.17 University Year Standing effective for the 1016/17 Undergraduate Calendar as presented
- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-GR-2 Admission Requirements and Eligibility effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented. (providing option to fast track to PhD)
- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-GR-11 Academic Standing effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented (progress reporting and thesis supervision language)

- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-GR-12 Thesis Requirements effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented. (Expectations for integrated thesis clarified; renaming it to Manuscript-based thesis)
- THAT Senate approve the revisions to Regulations R-GR-13 Time Limits for Program Completion effective for the 2026/27 Graduate Calendar as presented. (clarification of which graduate programs have a scheduled summer break)

Items for Information:

- UG Minor modifications for February and March (3 items)
- GR Minor modifications for March
- Updated Glossary
- 7-year Academic Schedule, including the Senate Guidelines, Master Schedule for Fall 2027 – Winter 2035 and Master Schedule for Summer 2028 - 2035

There was no discussion of the items for information.

- **Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC)**  
Committee Chair David Hornsby presented 8 major modifications for Senate approval and one memo regarding suspended program admissions for information.

Major Modifications:

These were bundled into an omnibus motion for expediency.

Omnibus motion:

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

The motion **PASSED**.

Individual motions from the Omnibus:

- 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.

- THAT Senate approve the introduction of IRM 3009 & deletion of IRM 3007 as presented with effect from Fall 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.
- THAT Senate approve the major modification to the Technology Innovation Management programs as presented with effect from Fall 2026.
- THAT Senate approve the introduction of WGST 3999 as presented with effect from Fall 2026.
- THAT Senate approve the major modification to PSYC 5904 as presented with effect from Fall 2026.
- THAT Senate approve the name change of the minor in Integrated Science to Interdisciplinary Science Application as presented with effect from Fall 2026.
- THAT Senate approve the major modification to the PhD in Information Technology program as presented with effect from Fall 2026.

Committee Chair Hornsby clarified that the closure of the MENG programs in the package should more accurately be seen as the closure of a pathway in Engineering for the IPIS program; the MIPIS degree therefore will be transferring to NPSIA.

Item for Information:

A memo confirming the suspended program admissions for the Bachelor Science Honour in Nanoscience was presented for information. There was no discussion of this item.

- **Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC)**

Committee Chair Richard Dansereau presented a motion for Senate to adopt revised guidelines for Senate Question Period. He reminded Senators that the guidelines had been brought to Senate in February, but were taken back to SAGC for further review due to a number of concerns brought by Senators including the following:

- The 30-minute limit is too rigid; the guidelines should incorporate more flexible language on this point.

- More clarity is needed on how questions are ordered in the binder, and questions on time-sensitive issues should be prioritized.
- Section 5 and the Table of Examples at the end of the document should be removed, as these appear to define topics within the purview of Senate too narrowly.

The Clerk also reported on a number of comments from the 2025 Senate Survey in which Senators requested more guardrails on questions for Question Period, particularly for those questions clearly outside of Senate’s purview. The Question Period Guidelines were drafted, in part, in response to these concerns from the survey.

SAGC considered all of this feedback then made these adjustments to the document:

- Point #1 – SAGC adjusted the language to mirror that of the AGU. The Guidelines have been updated to avoid creating any inconsistency with the provision in the AGU, which states that “up to one-half hour of the Senate meeting is devoted to [Question Period]”
- 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 has been moved to 6-c.
- The table at the end of the document has been removed.

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

Discussion:

Senators asked for more clarity on what would be considered inside/outside the purview of Senate. It was noted that the Act includes very broad language in describing the role of Senate. (Act Section 22 (i)) If following the Act, Senate Executive would have the latitude to include some questions that do not directly relate to Senate business. This was confirmed by the Chair; a Senate Executive Committee member added that questions that are not included in the Senate

binder would typically involve internal operational issues or process questions that would not be appropriate to bring to Senate.

Some Senators continued to request more flexibility on the time limit mentioned in point #1 of the guidelines. The SAGC Chair reminded Senators that the Guidelines cannot contradict the AGU. Some Senators suggested that SAGC consider changing this part of the AGU during its next review of the policy, to build in more flexibility in the timing of Question Period. In the meantime, a Senator proposed an amendment to the current guidelines to remove the specific time limit language from point #1 of the guidelines.

It was **MOVED** (J. Mason, A. Bordeleau) that the motion and guidelines be **amended** to remove “up to 30 minutes shall be devoted to the Question Period” from point #1.

A friendly amendment was suggested to remove additional language “Section 5.2.4” as well, so that point #1 reads: “A Question Period shall be held at each regular meeting of Senate (open session) in accordance with the Academic Governance of the University (AGU).” Senators Mason and Bordeleau agreed to the friendly amendment.

The motion to **AMEND** was **DEFEATED**.

Senator Chantal Trudel asked to have her abstention from this vote recorded in the minutes.

Senators then voted on the main motion, to approve the guidelines.

The motion **PASSED**.

The Chair thanked Senators for the robust discussion on this important item.

## **8. Artificial Intelligence Framework**

Vice-Provost (Academic & Global Learning) David Hornsby spoke to this item. The AI Framework builds upon and extends earlier work regarding Artificial Intelligence at Carleton, and provides general principles and guidance on the use of AI by students, instructors and researchers.

The current iteration of the AI Framework has been informed by extensive feedback from the Carleton community. Vice-Provost Hornsby provided a summary of some of the feedback to Senators, including the following comments and perspectives:

- The Framework is too “pro-AI.” Instructors should be able to opt out of its use.
- The Framework should acknowledge the need to protect academic freedom and intellectual property.
- Negative effects of AI on the environment should be recognized.
- Indigenous perspectives should be incorporated and accessibility should be acknowledged.
- Effects on labour and workload should be considered.
- Training and support across the community should be a priority.

Students also expressed concern in their feedback about the use of AI in grading, and there was some confusion among some respondents regarding the distinction between a framework and a policy.

Substantial changes made to the framework as a result of the feedback, and reflected in the current version, include the following:

- The framework confirms that it is a principles-based document and not a policy.
- The framework confirms that decisions about the use of AI rest with instructors, and the right to opt-out of AI use is stated in the framework.
- New definitions have been added.
- Indigenous and accessibility perspectives are included in the framework.
- A cross-functional advisory group on AI has been proposed.
- The framework highlights the need for AI literacy across campus.

Vice-Provost Hornsby added that the Framework is a living document that can be adapted according to new developments in AI. He reminded Senators that faculty members are not required to use AI, but the technology cannot be ignored, and the university has a responsibility to provide guidelines on its use.

In the ensuing discussion, Senators thanked the Vice-Provost and the working group for the revised framework. Reception of the framework was generally very positive.

- When asked about the financial implications of some aspects of the Framework, the Vice-Provost responded that decisions on resources will occur as implementation of the framework progresses.

- In response to a question, the Vice-Provost noted that students have indicated that what matters most to them is that expectations regarding AI use be made clear in syllabus language and transparent conversations in the classroom.
- The Vice-Provost also confirmed that the instructor is in control of course expectations, including the use of AI, and that these should be clarified and made explicit to students early on (in the syllabus, for example).

Senators had the following suggestions for further changes:

- In the spirit of inclusivity, TAs and Contract Instructors should also be named and included in the Framework.
- Development of AI-related procurement standards, mentioned on page 9 of the framework, should involve faculty with expertise in this area.
- Some tweaks to language in the Definitions were suggested for clarity.

The Chair thanked Senators for the robust conversation and Vice-Provost Hornsby and his team for their work on the Framework.

## **9. Reports for Information**

The following reports were submitted for information:

- a) Senate Executive Committee minutes (February 17, 2026)
- b) COU Academic Colleague Report

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

## **10. Other Business**

No other business was identified.

## **11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned (R. Renfroe, M. Francoli) at 3:21 pm.