

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 June 19, 2026 at 2:00 pm
PK608 + Zoom Videoconference**

**OPEN SESSION
MINUTES**

Present in Person: M. Bahran, S. Blanchard, A. Bordeleau, A. Bowker, J. Brunet, I. Bumagin, R. Dansereau (Clerk), J. Debanné, M. DeRosa, J. Drake, M. Francoli, R. Goubran, K. Graham, E. Gray, X. Haziza, M. Heroux, D. Hornsby, J. C. Jimenez-Garcia, I. Knezevic, B. MacLeod, L. Madokoro, D. McNair, D. Mendeloff, R. Miller, H. Nemiroff, A. Patrick, R. Renfroe, A. Shotwell, B. Tackaberry, N. Tait, W. Tettey (Chair), S. Viel, P. Williams, P. Wilson, W. Ye, F. M. Zamani

Present via Zoom: D. Amundsen, F. Brouard, A. Butler, J. P. Corriveau, A. El-Roby, G. Maracle, M. Rivers-Moore, M. Rooney, C. Ruiz-Martin, S. Sadaf

Regrets: J. Armstrong, J. Greenberg, A. Hurrelmann, G. Lachance, N. Laporte, J. Mason, M. Papineau, P. Rankin, R. Tfaily, C. Trudel, D. Tutkishbayeva, G. Wainer

Absent: A. Abdou, M. Agha, I. Alma, A. Arya, N. Bruni, S. Burges, T. Davidson, S. Duncan, M. El Sayed, N. Giroux-Laplante, N. Hagigi, E. Harlan, S. Hawkins, G. Lacroix, A. Masoumi, M. Mullally, K. Nyediin Buoy, K. Patel, E. Peirce, M. Vatankhah

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

1. Welcome and Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 pm. The Chair reported that the Closed Session in the draft agenda would not be included in the meeting, and requested that it be removed from the meeting agenda. There was no objection from Senators.

It was **MOVED** (M. Francoli, B. Tackaberry) that Senate approve the agenda for the meeting of Senate on June 19, 2026, as amended.

The motion **PASSED**.

2. Minutes: May 29, 2026 (open session)

The following corrections to the minutes were requested:

- An addition to the end of the discussion on the budget presentation was requested, to capture the Chair's closing remarks on the item.
- Item 7(b) SQAPC – Motion: new program – Bachelor of Entrepreneurship: A sentence indicating that the motion passed is needed.
- Item 7(b) - SQAPC - Cyclical Program Reviews – A sentence indicating that the omnibus motion passed is needed.

It was **MOVED** (A. Bowker, M. DeRosa) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting on May 29, 2026, as amended.

The motion **PASSED**.

3. Matters Arising

The Clerk of Senate reported on a matter arising from the previous meeting. A Senator had raised a concern regarding how the Question Period discussions at Senate Executive Committee meetings were being minuted. The Senate Executive Committee discussed this concern at their meeting on June 9th. The committee concluded that moving forward, a summary of the topic of each question would be noted in the minutes, and if the decision is not to include the question in the binder, the minutes will indicate why, and how the question is being referred, if applicable. The committee feels that this approach balances both transparency and privacy concerns.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began his remarks by thanking all who participated in the Convocation celebrations from June 8 to 12, 2026. 17 ceremonies were held, 3 honorary degrees awarded and over 5,300 students crossed the stage. The Chair extended congratulations to graduating students, including Student Senators, and wished them all the best in their future endeavours.

The Chair then congratulated Ron Miller, who has been appointed Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Design. Professor Miller had been serving as Interim Dean for the past year, and steps into the role as Dean on July 1, 2026.

Congratulations were also extended to Amber Butler, who has been reappointed as University Librarian for a 5-year term, effective July 1, 2027, following her administrative leave.

In research news, the Chair noted that Professors Menna Agha and Hamza Bashandy have been awarded over \$240,000 from the New Frontiers in Research Fund, for their work in democratizing access to co-design tools in architecture.

The Chair reminded Senators that June is Pride Month and also Indigenous History Month. Details on events planned for these celebrations can be found on the university website.

Finally, the Chair reported on the activities of the Task Force on Community Healing, Rebuilding and Belonging. He noted that Cathy Malcolm Edwards and Sarah Todd have assumed the leadership of the group, as Kahente Horn-Miller has stepped away from the role due to health issues. Meetings with the membership and Elders' group so far have focused on mapping out a schedule of activities, including consultations with the Carleton community over the summer. Information regarding opportunities to share perspectives and ideas will be posted soon.

The Chair reminded Senators of the mandate of the task force which is to:

- (re)build and/or sustain a safe, equitable and inclusive environment that is conducive to pursuing Carleton University's mission and vision for inclusive impact and prominence, together; and
- Foster a campus community culture in which we collectively uphold mutually reinforcing obligations to our values, including academic freedom and freedom of expression; critical and robust engagement with issues; respect for diversity of opinions and perspectives; civility, belonging, and mutual flourishing; and institutional impartiality.

There were no questions from Senators or further discussion on these items.

5. Question Period

One question from Senator Laura Madokoro was circulated in advance to Senators:

At the last meeting of Senate (May 29) we had a robust discussion about deferred exams. Important measures have been undertaken to ensure that the deferred exams are used for their intended purposes. In the process, however, certain student groups are being made to bear the burden of abuses by others. For instance, the revised policy states that "Minor illnesses and ongoing chronic illnesses under medical management will not be considered valid grounds for granting a deferred final examination." While the discussion at Senate emphasized that students with chronic illnesses are expected to be able to manage these illnesses, this particular framing does not account for those instances when

students are not able to manage those illnesses despite their best intentions. Could this policy please be reviewed and revised to fully account for the particular needs of students with chronic illnesses and to ensure that one student group is not being penalized in efforts to deter abuses of the deferred examination system?

Response from Associate Registrar Dotty Nwakanma: The question relates to Section 4.3.3 of the Undergraduate Calendar (Early Departure from Final Examinations) and specifically to the last sentence in this section, which is quoted in the question. Associate Registrar Nwakanma clarified that this condition applies to students who are at the final exam or have seen the final exam, but then wish to depart from that exam to apply for a deferral. In the case of chronic illnesses, it is also expected that the illness is being properly managed in the period leading up to the exam. However, if students present with symptoms or have a medical emergency during the exam, there are allowances for accommodations with the proper medical documentation.

In the follow-up discussion, some Senators noted that the previous language “..will normally not be considered valid grounds...” seemed to capture the current practice more accurately, whereas the revised language (“will not be considered”) implies that there is no recourse for students experiencing an episode during an exam. The Associate Registrar noted that the language can be reviewed again at SCCASP, given these concerns.

6. Administration (Clerk)

a. Membership Ratification

The Clerk presented a revised memo to ratify Brett Tackaberry and Jim Devoe as Board of Governor Representatives on Senate.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, D. Mendeloff) that Senate ratify the following Senate appointments, for service beginning July 1, 2026.

The motion **PASSED**.

7. Reports:

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

Committee Chair David Mendeloff presented two items for information:

- Late minor modifications to the Bachelor of Science Honours in Nursing for the 2026-27 calendar, consisting of course modifications and

adjustments.

- Collateral changes to the 2026-27 calendar. These were necessitated by previous program changes approved by Senate.

There was no discussion of these items.

b. Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC)

Committee Chair David Hornsby presented three major modifications and one cyclical program review for Senate approval. The major modifications were combined into an Omnibus motion for efficiency.

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

The motion **PASSED**.

Individual motions from the Omnibus:

- THAT Senate approve the major modification to the BSc Undeclared program, as presented with effect from Fall 2027
- THAT Senate approve the major modification and name change to the MA programs in Communication as presented with effect from Fall 2027 (to MA Communication & Media Studies)
- THAT Senate approve the major modification to the MA programs in European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies as presented with effect from Fall 2027.

Cyclical Program Reviews

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, M. Francoli) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries arising from the Cyclical Program Review of the graduate programs in International Affairs.

Discussion: A Senator noted that the review included 12 identified areas for improvement, and asked how these were received by the unit. The Committee Chair responded that there is no information yet on whether all recommendations are being implemented or were agreed to.

The motion **PASSED**.

c. Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC)

Committee Chair Richard Dansereau presented a memo to ratify 3 nominees

for Senate committees, for service beginning July 1, 2026.

- SQAPC – David Amundsen (Science faculty member)
- SAGC – Rodney Nelson (faculty member)
- Senate Review Committee – Farah Hosseinian (Science faculty member)

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, K. Graham) that Senate ratify the nominees for Senate committees, as presented, for service beginning July 1, 2026.

The motion **PASSED**.

8. Report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Academic Integrity Policy

Ad Hoc Committee Chair Donald Russell spoke to this item. He began with a review of the project, which began in Fall 2024, partly in response to the restructuring of the former Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs (FGPA), but also due to other concerns, including the impact of artificial intelligence on academic integrity.

The committee met a total of 20 times over the past two years and revised the policy three times in response to several consultation sessions with stakeholder groups. The final revised draft resulting from these consultations and revisions was circulated to Senators in the binder.

Some of the main changes have been outlined in the report and include:

- Updating the terminology section
- Reorganizing sections for greater clarity and flow
- The proposal of a new Academic Integrity Committee to oversee the policy, to identify any new issues in academic integrity that may arise and need to be considered in the policy, and to provide a context for consultation and consistency in the execution of the policy.
- Automatic consideration of dismissal of cases that are not resolved within 8 months.
- A consideration of the impact of artificial intelligence on academic integrity
- Incorporating a pathway for graduate academic integrity issues not related to coursework
- Identifying a process for rescinding an expulsion
- Recognizing exceptions for accredited programs
- Updating the records section to align with FIPPA requirements and records management best practices.

- Other changes and edits to improve clarity.

The Ad Hoc Committee Chair then presented a 3-part motion, to be considered together as one.

It was **MOVED** (P. Wilson, R. Renfroe) that:

- Senate approve the proposed revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy in the attached document and implement these revisions beginning in September of 2026,
- Senate establish a new standing Committee to carry out the duties assigned to it in the revised policy, and
- Senate instruct the new committee to deal with any additional issues or concerns that may be raised in Senate.

Discussion:

Several Senators questioned the need for the new Senate Academic Integrity Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee Chair noted that the new committee would have oversight of the policy, would be able to discuss inter-Faculty cases, and could report more broadly on Academic Integrity than the appeals committee, which only sees a subset of academic integrity cases. In response to another question from Senate, the committee Chair noted that a faculty-member-at-large could be considered as an addition to the membership if it is the will of Senate.

Other Senators raised questions and concerns about the 8-month time limit for cases. Would supports be in place so that legitimate cases would not be lost because of a timing issue? In response it was noted that resourcing is a Faculty-level issue that varies across timelines and Faculties, and it is not in the scope of the policy to address that issue. The committee Chair also acknowledged that some complex cases might need extra time to work through, but that the new committee could be used as a resource to help clarify, with the Faculty Dean, whether an extensive delay is justified. The new committee also can report back to Senate on the number of cases that were dismissed due to long delay.

Senators also expressed concerns with the process of bringing the revised policy forward. It was noted that feedback from the Deans and the Provost had not been received by the committee, and would be important information for Senators to consider before voting on the policy. Some Senators remarked that the process felt rushed and that they would welcome more time for discussion and feedback, both at Senate and within their own Faculty Boards.

A Senator asked whether it would be possible to incorporate a process whereby instructors who suspect a student of an academic integrity violation could immediately enter a GNA into the student's record, so that the student cannot withdraw from the course. The committee Chair replied that the Ad Hoc Committee members felt strongly that there should be no record of a student simply being accused of an academic integrity offence, due to privacy issues, and that there are still legitimate reasons for a student to drop a course after being accused by the instructor of a violation of the policy.

A Senator asked if it would be possible for instructors to provide additional evidence to the Dean at some point in the process. The committee Chair agreed that it could be considered under Clause C.

A Senator asked a question about overlapping cases. If a student already has a pending allegation of breaching academic integrity, and, before that case has been resolved, is accused again in a separate case, would those two cases still be considered as "first offences?" The committee chair replied that any case that has not yet been resolved cannot be considered a violation. He added that it is important that previous violations not bias the decision on a current allegation. Knowledge of previous violations can only be used for determining the penalty. The initial decision should not be contaminated by bias in considering the prior offences. This has been the practice at Carleton for several decades.

Discussion concluded at this point. The Chair thanked Senators for their input, and the committee for their hard work on a very complex policy. The Chair then called the question.

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

Senators thanked Don Russell and, despite the outcome of the vote, commended the Ad Hoc Committee members for the long and careful work on the policy. Senate responded further with a round of applause.

The Clerk noted that the Ad Hoc Committee was created via a recommendation from the Senate Academic Governance Committee, and the Ad Hoc Committee's TOR was drafted by SAGC. Consequently, it would be logical to refer the policy and the report submitted back to the Senate Academic Governance Committee, to determine next steps.

It was **MOVED** (R. Dansereau, S. Viel) that the Academic Integrity Policy Report be referred to the Senate Academic Governance Committee, which will gather and review feedback from the University Community, including the Deans, Provost and Senators on the proposed revisions, and then will provide recommendations back to Senate.

A Senator proposed a friendly amendment to the motion as follows:

It is **MOVED** that the Academic Integrity Policy Report be referred to the Senate Academic Governance Committee, which will *oversee the gathering and reviewing of* feedback from the University Community, including the Deans, Provost and Senators on the proposed revisions, and then will provide recommendations back to Senate.

The mover and seconder agreed to the friendly amendment.

The motion **PASSED**.

The Chair thanked all Senators for their input and engagement in this process.

9. Report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Petitions & Appeals

Senator Paul Wilson, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Petitions & Appeals, spoke to this report. He noted that this Ad Hoc Committee also has been meeting for two years, and that there is some overlap in membership between the two ad hoc committees.

This committee's mandate was to draft an entirely new Senate Policy on Petitions & Appeals drawing upon and bringing together mostly existing rules and procedures on petitions and appeals as outlined in the undergraduate and graduate calendars. The scope of the policy is restricted to petitions and appeals related to course grades or the application of university regulations. The policy also incorporates changes to graduate petitions and appeals in response to the restructuring of the former Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs (FGPA).

The new draft policy draws heavily upon current calendar language, with some changes. Some of these include:

- Clarification of process, particularly in identifying the responsible office or committee for specific petitions and appeals.
- Clarification of terminology/nomenclature for consistency (re petition vs. appeal)
- Harmonization of grade appeal process for undergraduate and graduate students
- Acknowledgement of the exception for accredited professional programs (e.g. Engineering, Nursing) when approved by the relevant Faculty Board and Senate

- Providing options for students if an instructor fails to respond to grade-related questions

The Committee Chair then presented the motion to Senate. The motion includes a direction to update appropriate Terms of Reference and calendars before the policy takes effect, to ensure consistency.

It was **MOVED** (P. Wilson, A. Bowker) that Senate:

- approve the proposed Petitions & Appeals Policy as presented, and that the policy come into force upon approval of the necessary Calendar changes and revised Terms of Reference for SUSC;
- refer the proposed revisions to the SUSC Terms of Reference to SAGC and request that SAGC report back to Senate at an early date to recommend updated SUSC Terms of Reference that would be congruent with the Policy;
- request that SCCASP review the Undergraduate and Graduate Calendars (in particular, s.3.3 and s.15 respectively) and report back to Senate at an early date to recommend such changes as are required to bring the Undergraduate and Graduate Calendar regulations into conformity with the Policy
- request that SAGC develop a policy on procedural review by the Clerk for recommendation to Senate.

Discussion:

Senators asked for some clarification regarding the 10-day deadline for instructors to respond to a student's grade petition (S.7.1.6), specifically in the case of an instructor who has gone on leave, or a contract instructor whose contract has ended. The committee Chair noted that in these cases, students would approach the Associate Dean who would receive the case and then decide how to proceed. He added the policy does not imply that Contract Instructors are obliged to work outside of their contract. Other Senators spoke in favour of this section within the policy, noting that it allows these cases to be resolved without extensive delays.

The Chair recognized Vice Provost (Graduate Studies) Nadeem Siddiqi, who clarified that although point 3 of the motion does not mention the Graduate Council, they will still have the authority to amend and approve the Graduate Calendar.

The discussion concluded and the Chair called the question.

The motion **PASSED**.

The Chair thanked the Ad Hoc Committee team for their work on the policy.

10. Carleton Towards 100

Project Lead Rick Colbourne and Project Manager Brian Guzzo provided an update on the Carleton@100 strategic planning process. Unlike previous 5-year strategic plans, this project looks to define an academic direction for Carleton for the next 15 years, or until Carleton turns 100. In exploring what futures are possible, the plan will seek to identify where Carleton should concentrate capability and commitment to excellence. Co-creation is a key component of this plan and it is achieved through engagement, dialogues and conversations with various communities.

The project is organized around five strategic themes, each supported by a dedicated working group.

- Teaching & Learning
- Student Experience
- Research & Scholarly Impact
- Community Engagement & Partnerships
- Institutional Health & Sustainability

Each working group will examine priorities, opportunities and challenges in their area, and will submit preliminary recommendations for directions to consider as the plan develops.

Project timeline:

- March 2026 – Project Launch; Governance and Framework established
- Spring 2026 - Working groups established and activated
- Summer 2026 – Environmental scans within working groups complete
- Fall 2026 – Consultation and Engagement Period
- October to December 2026 – Identification of strategic themes
- December 2026 to March 2027 – drafting of preliminary plan
- April 2027 - final plan approved by the Board of Governors

The project timeline includes the following suggested updates for Senate:

- September 2026 – Review of early signals; Working group consultation plans
- October 2026 – Progress Report on working Group consultation and Engagement
- December 2026/January 2027 – Provide input on Strategic Directions
- February 2027 – Review Draft Strategic Plan

- April 2027 – Review of *Towards Carleton@100*

Discussion: A Senator noted that the working group membership appears to be dominated by STEM representation and asked if there are any mechanisms in place to balance this out. In response it was noted that the team had worked carefully to balance the mix of skills and capabilities of all applicants in putting together the groups, but for those individuals or units that do not find themselves represented in the working groups there are and will be other means of engaging with the process and providing input, particularly through the consultation process in the Fall.

The Chair thanked the Project Lead and Project Manager for the update.

11. Reports for Information:

- a. Senate Executive Committee Minutes (May 19, 2026)

12. Other Business

None was identified.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned (P. Wilson, D. Hornsby) at 4:05 pm.