



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 28, 2025 at 2:00 pm
Pigiarvik 608**

AGENDA

Closed Session

- 1. Welcome & Approval of Agenda**
- 2. Minutes (Closed):** February 28, 2025
- 3. Report from the Honorary Degrees Committee**
- 4. Other Confidential Business**

Open Session:

- 1. Approval of Agenda**
- 2. Minutes (Open):** February 28, 2025
- 3. Matters Arising**
- 4. Chair's Remarks**
- 5. Question Period**
- 6. Administration (Clerk)**
 - a. Senate membership ratifications
 - b. Senate meeting schedule 2025-26
 - c. Senate Survey 2025

7. Reports:

- a. SCCASP (J. Wallace)
- b. SQAPC (D. Hornsby)
- c. SAGC (E. Sloan)
- d. Medals & Prizes Committee (Medals Policy) (E. Sloan)

8. Motion from Jody Mason

9. Reports for Information:

- a. Senate Executive Minutes (February 18, 2025)
- b. Report from COU Academic Colleague
- c. UPC and TPAC Membership Reports for 2025

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 28, 2025 at 2:00 pm
PK608**

MINUTES – OPEN SESSION

Present: J. Armstrong, M. Bahran, M. Barbeau, S. Blanchard, A. Bordeleau, A. Bowker, F. Brouard, S. Burges, A. Buri, J. Chan, J. P. Corriveau, E. Cyr, J. Debanne, M. DeRosa, R. Goubran, K. Graham, L. Grant, E. Gray, J. Greenberg, T. Haats, N. Hagigi, M. Haines, S. Hawkins, X. Haziza, , K. Hellemans, D. Hornsby, D. Howe, L. Kostiuk, P. Kouzovnikov, G. Lacroix, A. Lannon, N. Laporte, J. Lynch, A. MacDonald, B. MacLeod, L. Madokoro, G. Maracle, J. Mason, D. McNair, D. Mendeloff, M. Nadeem, B. O'Neill, A. Paiva, P. Rankin, R. Renfroe, M. Rivers-Moore, M. Rooney, S. Sadaf, A. Shotwell, E. Sloan (Clerk), W. Tettey (Chair), R. Tfaily, R. Treasure, C. Trudel, C. Viau, S. Viel, G. Wainer, J. Wallace, P. Williams

Regrets: R. Gorelick, L. Marshall, D. Maseko, A. Masoumi, S. Monastero, H. Nemiroff, Y. Ono, M. Papineau, M. Pearson, O. Saloojee, C. Smelser, D. Sprague, R. Teather

Absent: M. Abarghouei, T. Davidson, S. El Fitori, B. Heerspink, J. Kundu

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

1. Welcome & Approval of Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 pm. The Chair noted that the meeting would begin with a Closed Session to approve the Winter graduation lists.

It was **MOVED** (A. Paiva, A. Shotwell) 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:

The Chair noted that item 6(a) Administration – Senate Schedule 2025-26 has been pulled from the agenda and will be presented at the next Senate meeting.

It was **MOVED** (C. Viau, A. Paiva) that Senate approve the open agenda for the meeting of Senate on February 28, 2025, as amended.

The motion **PASSED**.

2. Minutes: January 31, 2025

It was **MOVED** (E. Gray, A. Paiva) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting of January 31, 2025 as presented.

A Senator noticed a typo on page 18 regarding the date of the February 2025 Senate meeting.

With this amendment to the minutes, the motion **PASSED**.

3. Matters Arising:

There were none.

4. Chair's Remarks

The Chair began his remarks noting the recent passing of Dr. Roland Leigh Jeffreys, faculty member at Carleton from 1967-2005, and former Chair of the Classics Department. The Chair expressed condolences to all that knew and loved him.

The Chair reminded Senators of the in-person protocols, and noted that due to technical issues the hybrid meeting option for Senate would be suspended for this meeting.

The Chair next extended congratulations to the 20+ recipients of this year's Achievement Awards. These awards honour the research and teaching excellence of Carleton's academic staff and recognize impactful and dedicated efforts in advancing knowledge.

The Chair also noted that Virtual Ventures, run by the Faculty of Engineering and Design, has won the 2024 Actua Award for Excellence in outstanding STEM outreach. The program has grown to over 22,000 youth participants, which is double the number from 2 years ago. The Chair congratulated those responsible for this high-impact program.

February marked the global celebration of Black History Month. The Chair made note of several events on campus including his conversation with Professor Adrian Harewood on Black advancement within the Canadian academic context, and the February 11th Black on the Ballot panel and discussion. The Chair thanked all who took the time to support these events.

On February 20th, over 200 faculty and staff members were recognized for their dedicated service at the annual Service Excellence Awards. The Chair extended congratulations to all nominees and winners.

The Chair also reminded Senators that March 8 is International Women's Day. The Carleton community will be highlighting the social, economic, cultural and political achievements of women across the university through a number of special events and communications. Senators were encouraged to take part and to support these events.

Finally, the Chair noted that February 28, 2025 marks the beginning of the month of Ramadan. He extended warmest wishes to all Muslim students, faculty and staff for this time of reflection, prayer and community.

5. Question Period

Questions were submitted in advance by 5 Senators:

Questions submitted by Senator Sean Burges:

In a time where academic units are being asked to innovate, collaborate, and make hard decisions, academic staff need clarity about how 'bums on seats' in classrooms translates into funding and resources flowing to departments/programs and to the University itself.

- 1) How does the university calculate the funding that flows to a department/program on a per student enrolled in said department/program basis?

- 2) How does the university calculate the funding that flows to a department/program for each student enrolled in a class delivered by that department/program?
- 3) How does the funding flowing to an academic department/program translate into resources available for planning and delivering education and student enrichment?
- 4) How does enrolment at the University translate into funding flows from the Province?
- 5) How much of the University's funding (nominal and percentage) from the Province comes in the form a 'block grant' and a 'student enrolment contingent grant'?
- 6) Can you please explain how enrolment-based funding from the Province to the University is calculated and under what envelopes it falls.
- 7) Is there a limit to how much operating funding the University can get from the Province by increasing enrolments?

With the consent of Senator Burges, these questions were answered by the Provost in Item 8 – University Funding: A Primer.

Question Submitted by Allan Buri:

At its March 1st, 2024 meeting, Senate repealed the Academic Accommodations During Labour Disputes Policy. According to the minutes from its April 14th, 2023 meeting, this Policy was the mechanism that required a meeting of the Academic Continuity Committee (ACC) to specifically discuss academic accommodations after eleven days of the CUPE 4600 strike. CASG was also consulted during those discussions. Without this Policy, what procedural mechanisms are required to trigger a meeting of the ACC to discuss academic accommodations, and is the Senate Executive Committee still committed to engaging with CASG to discuss academic accommodations during potential labour disputes, including SAT/UNSAT?

Response by Provost Pauline Rankin: The Academic Continuity Committee (ACC) is chaired by the Provost and can meet any time it is needed; accommodations and any other relevant issues can be discussed by the committee when it meets. The Provost reminded Senators that the ACC met during Covid and consulted with CASG on academic accommodations at that time as well. This approach will continue as merited.

Questions submitted by Jody Mason:

Now that faculties have numbers for the early retirement offer and for CI cuts for 2025-26:

- what is the plan to ensure that units will be able to offer academic programs in 2025-26 (and going forward) of the same quality they have been offering in the past? (“quality” is affected by many factors, including instructor-student ratios, access to equipment, breadth of course offerings, etc.)
- what does the university expect to save as a result of these combined measures (early retirement offer + CI cuts) / does the university have examples from other universities of how such measures have actually helped save money?

Response by Provost Pauline Rankin: The Voluntary Retirement Incentive Program was offered to faculty and staff who were already eligible for retirement; therefore, it is not an early retirement incentive. The average age of those contacted was 69.

29% of those contacted, or 154 employees, took up the offer for Voluntary Retirement, which is a higher response rate than initially anticipated. Of these, 27% are faculty members spread across the 5 Faculties, and 73% are professional staff. All who applied for the VRIP were approved.

In order to ensure quality of programs, the Deans of all Faculties will be prioritizing core courses, leveraging technology, reviewing resource allocations and increasing the T.A. support where appropriate. The Provost noted that it is too soon to report on the financial impact of the VRIP program, and on how many positions will need to be refilled. More details will be forthcoming when the operating budget report is presented to Senate in April.

Some Senators spoke of anticipated stresses within academic departments due to the loss of long-serving administrative staff with valuable institutional knowledge. The Provost responded that the Deans will submit staffing requests after assessing their needs.

A Senator asked about mid-level administrative management “glut” and whether more cuts could be made to the management positions not directly connected to teaching and research. The Provost responded that administrators are important members of the Carleton team and do much to support faculty members in fulfilling the university’s academic mission; it is not helpful to pit academic staff against administrative staff in this situation or to assume that one group is more important than the other, as we are all part of the same team working towards the same goals.

In response to another question, Vice-Provost Hornsby clarified that suspension of enrolment in a program does not require Senate approval, but Senate will be informed when this happens. Suspension, which is not the same as closure, is only permitted for 2 academic

cycles. Senate approval is then required for a program to come out of suspension.

Questions submitted by Gabriel Wainer

Question 1:

On January's senate, the following question was asked: "Students facing Academic Offenses have the right to appeal decisions made by the Dean's office to the Senate Appeals Committee. However, in some situations, the opposite would need to be considered. There are cases related to Academic Integrity or Academic Offenses dismissed without proper investigation due to delays in the process or the backlog of cases. Additionally, there are instances where the Dean's office dismisses an offense despite the instructor's strong certainty regarding the violation and adherence to standard reporting procedures, sometimes without providing a clear explanation on the decisions."

In a previous Senate meeting, it was requested to handle Academic Offenses "in a timely manner". Nevertheless, "timely manner" has been defined as "two terms after the offence". According to past practices, a "timely manner" was 2 weeks to 1 month. How can guarantee that instructors do not have to wait two terms (or a year) to solve cases of plagiarism, and that handling of the cases is independent of the authorities in charge of the case?

Response by Faculty of Engineering & Design Dean Larry Kostiuk: Faculties may have different timelines for resolving academic integrity cases, but all Faculties are aligned with regards to academic integrity guidelines and processes as outlined in the policy.

Prior to 2021, the Academic Integrity Policy contained very strict timelines for faculty members to submit documents and for Associate Deans to send out letters. Due to the tsunami of academic integrity issues during the Covid pandemic, these timelines were removed from the policy. "In a timely manner" is therefore not clearly defined.

Some flexibility is built into the timelines around the initial response, considering the complexity of the issue and the Instructor's marking load. At the Associate Dean level, if the case is isolated and straight-forward, a decision on whether to pursue the case can be made within a few days of receiving the allegation, and the entire file generally can be resolved within a month. Less-straight-forward cases where there are a number of allegations in peak time (midterm, end of term) can cause a backlog and a divergence from the expected timelines. The goal is to resolve the case within the term in which it occurs, but if the final exam is involved the case will extend into the next term.

The Dean noted that there have been some extreme situations in FED, for example 40+ student cases submitted within a single allegation; these obviously would take much longer to resolve.

In a follow-up question, a Senator asked how delaying resolution of academic integrity cases can be considered equitable, as it holds students back from progressing within their program.

The Dean acknowledged the concern with timelines and added that in the Faculty of Engineering and Design, additional academics were brought on as Assistant Deans (Academic Integrity) to work alongside the Associate Deans to address the large number of cases.

Question 2

The Faculty of Engineering has to provide a Constitution to Senate. It has been told that the guidelines are under preparation. Although this is a major commitment: is there a timeline as for when is the Constitution going to be submitted for discussion and approval? As there is no Constitution available in Engineering, is there any kind of superset of University rules that the Faculty of Engineering should be following while there is no Constitution in place?

- a. Yes: which ones and where are they available?
- b. No: should Engineering adhere to past practices? (defined as “Before COVID practices). Or is there any other set of rules that should be used in the meantime?

Response from Clerk of Senate and SAGC Chair Elinor Sloan: The Engineering Faculty Board Constitution is currently being drafted by Professor Don Russell. The Senate Academic Governance Committee will receive a draft in March or April and expects to bring it to Senate for approval by June of this year. In the meantime, the Academic Governance of the University (AGU) provides governance guidelines for Senate and Faculty Boards.

Question 3:

The section:

<https://calendar.carleton.ca/undergrad/regulations/academicregulationsoftheuniversity/grading/#course-outline> specifies Carleton’s course outline.

The rules are clear, and covers the generic aspects of outlines. Nevertheless, there has been some language at Senate and Faculties not written formally anywhere. In particular, it has been said numerous times that the course outline is a “contract”, but there is no such

language. But in some cases it's being used as a "contract". Similarly, there are "implicit" rules about what should be in a course outline, and such rules change according to which reads the rules, the professor asking the question, or the person that makes the decision. The decisions are made based on "regulations", but such regulations do not exist in writing. If a Professor decides to use a strategy for their class, and they are denied to use such strategy based on a non-existing regulation is brought, this would be affecting the Professor's Academic Freedom.

Question: Do professors only have to adhere to the rules in the link above, exactly as written, or there is any further written documentation explaining in detail what can be included in a Course Outline, what cannot be included, the things that a Professor can do to teach their class, and the way in which students are evaluated, following Academic Freedom in their classroom?

Response from Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President Academic David Hornsby: Regulations around course outlines and teaching practices are dispersed among a number of different places, not just the calendar as indicated in the question. Vice-Provost Hornsby agreed that a central resource on course outlines for faculty members would be helpful, and should be developed as soon as possible.

Question submitted by Nir Hagigi:

Given that academic freedom is a core principle of scholarly inquiry, and considering that many institutions have already established mechanisms to monitor and address academic freedom concerns, what steps would be required to explore the creation of a similar procedure at Carleton? Is there a process or timeline for reviewing this issue, and if not, how can one be established? Furthermore, which body within the university would be responsible for overseeing and implementing such a mechanism?

Rationale

Academic freedom is a fundamental principle that protects faculty, researchers, and students in their ability to engage in intellectual inquiry, express different perspectives, and pursue scholarship without undue interference. However, Carleton University currently lacks a sufficient and structured mechanism for addressing academic freedom violations. Furthermore, unlike many of our peer institutions (such as the [University of Ottawa](#), [McGill University](#), [Wilfrid Laurier University](#), etc.), Carleton lacks a dedicated policy safeguarding academic freedom, leaving a critical gap.

- For students, there is no formalized body to hear concerns when academic freedom is restricted. The only current reporting mechanism is Equity and Inclusive Communities (EIC), which primarily addresses discrimination and hate crimes, not violations of academic freedom. If a student is censored, penalized, or restricted in their academic work or extracurriculars due to political speech, controversial research topics, or institutional pressures, there is no clear appeals process.

In recent years, concerns about self-censorship, institutional overreach, and the suppression of critical scholarship, particularly in politically sensitive fields, have grown within universities across Canada. Without a dedicated mechanism to examine these issues, our institution risks failing to adequately uphold its commitment to academic freedom for its community.

Establishing a structured mechanism to address academic freedom violations at Carleton University would benefit the entire academic community by creating a more accountable and intellectually open environment:

- Faculty would gain stronger institutional support in defending their ability to pursue critical scholarship without fear of administrative interference or external pressure.
- For students, it would provide a clear avenue to raise concerns when their academic expression is restricted, ensuring that intellectual exploration and debate remain protected within the classroom and beyond.
- The administration would benefit from a standardized process to handle academic freedom concerns proactively rather than reactively, reducing the likelihood of reputational harm and extended legal battles.

Response from Provost Pauline Rankin: As defined in the CUASA Collective Agreement, academic freedom is in place to offer those involved in research and teaching

- *Freedom in carrying out research and in publishing results thereof*
- *Freedom in carrying out teaching and discussing their subject*
- *Freedom from institutional censorship*

Academic Freedom is enshrined in Article 4 of the CUASA Collective Agreement, in Article 10 of the Collective Agreement for Postdoctoral Fellows and in Article 10 of the CUPE 4600 – #2 Collective Agreement for Contract Instructors.

The procedure for resolution of any claim for members of these unions is dealt with through established grievance processes. The suggestion for creating a new mechanism

would need to be negotiated as part of a collective bargaining process rather than via a Senate motion.

Freedom of expression and freedom of speech for students is protected through Carleton's Freedom of Speech policy. Section 5 of the Student Rights and Responsibility Policy also outlines students' rights to freedom of discussion and assembly and the right to a fair process. The Department of Equity and Inclusive Communities is not the appropriate venue to address claims of violation of freedom of speech unless these raise a question of discrimination and/or harassment under one of the protected grounds within the Ontario Human Rights Code. The Provost suggested that the process for students be clarified within the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy, rather than by creating yet another committee or policy. Coincidentally, the Rights & Responsibilities Policy is up for review and this issue can be raised as part of this review during the consultation phase.

The Chair thanked Senators for the questions and the responses.

6. Administration (Clerk)

a) Senate Schedule

This item was pulled from the binder and deleted from the agenda.

7. Reports:

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

Committee Chair Julia Wallace presented 3 items for Senate approval and 3 items for information.

Items for approval:

Advanced Standing for CEGEP Students

It was **MOVED** (J. Wallace, D. Hornsby) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1349: R-ADM-General-Section 12. Transfers from Quebec CEGEPs effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Admission Requirements for C. J. I. I. C. transferring into B. J.

It was **MOVED** (J. Wallace, N. Hagigi) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1375: R-ADM-Program-B.J. effective for the 2025-26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Admission Regulations for C. J. I. I. C.

It was **MOVED** (J. Wallace, B. O'Neill) that Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-2306: R-ADM-Program-C.J.I.I.C effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

Items for Information

- Undergraduate minor modifications for February 4, 2025
- Graduate minor modifications for February 4, 2025
- Undergraduate minor modifications for February 18, 2025

There was no discussion of these items.

b) Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC)

Committee Chair David Hornsby presented 2 cyclical review reports, 15 major modifications, and one revised policy for Senate approval, plus minor modifications from Dominican University College for information.

Cyclical Reviews:

Omnibus Motion:

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, R. Renfro) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries arising from the Cyclical Reviews of the undergraduate and graduate programs as indicated.

The motion **PASSED**.

Motions within the Omnibus:

- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Business.
- THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Journalism.

Major Modifications:

Undergraduate Programs in Canadian Studies:

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, A. Bowker) that Senate approve the deletion of the undergraduate programs in Canadian Studies as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

Discussion:

The Chair of SQAPC clarified that the specific programs in Canadian studies targeted for closure include:

- Bachelor of Arts (Canadian Studies)
- Bachelor of Arts, Honours (Canadian Studies)
- Bachelor of Arts, combined honours (Canadian studies)
- Mention Française
- Minor in Quebec Studies

These programs are closing due to steep decline in enrolments combined with a shortage of qualified faculty members. The Dean of FASS added that the Minor in Canadian Studies is paused for revamping, and will be reopened next year.

A Senator asked if all of these programs could be paused rather than closed; the Dean responded that the programs marked for closure have very small enrolments and no resources to continue. Moving forward, the focus will be on the Master's program and possibly the minor at the undergraduate level. The Dean also emphasized that Canadian Studies content is continuing; courses will still be offered and the minor will return.

Another Senator noted that robust documentation with a full rationale and justification for the program closure with data on enrolment numbers was not supplied at FASS Faculty Board. The Senator added that they had wanted to bring a motion for Senators to have this information presented whenever a motion to close a program was brought for Senate approval, but they were told that these questions would have been raised and addressed during the curriculum review process.

The Chair of SQAPC noted that their committee receives full rationale and justification from the Dean plus decisions from the Faculty Curriculum Committee and Faculty Board. A robust conversation at SQAPC takes all of these into account. The SQAPC Chair added that by the time the documentation reaches SQAPC, committee members are confident

that the Faculty Board, curriculum committee, Dean's Office and the relevant Department have given the matter fair consideration. The Chair of SCCASP added that their meetings always include representation from Admissions to add more information and perspective to the discussion.

It was noted that faculty members do have the right to request more data at their departmental and Faculty Board meetings in order to make informed decisions on these closures. Deans should also be ready to answer these questions on the Senate floor. The Dean of FASS agreed to provide more fulsome data at future Faculty Board meetings for any additional program closures.

A Senator remarked that changes within Canadian Studies have occurred as a result of a series of decisions over the years, one of which was to move Indigenous Studies out of the School and have it join the Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies. The Provost noted that Indigenous Studies was moved out of the School at the request of Indigenous faculty, who no longer felt comfortable under the rubric of something called "Canada" given their own considerations around sovereignty. The School always had a very small complement of faculty, and when several of them moved into administrative roles (Provost, Deputy Provost) they were not replaced. Finally, the Provost noted in closing the discussion, that the School voted as a department in favour of closing these programs.

The motion **PASSED**.

To expedite the process, the remaining 14 major modification motions were combined into one omnibus motion.

Omnibus Motion – Major Modifications

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

The motion **PASSED**.

Individual motions from the omnibus:

- **MECT 4907**

THAT Senate approve the introduction of MECT 4907 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **Undergraduate Certificate in Journalism in Indigenous Communities**
THAT Senate approve the introduction of the undergraduate Certificate in Journalism in Indigenous Communities and JOUR 1107 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **Undergraduate Programs in Music**
THAT Senate approve the major modification to the undergraduate programs in Music and MUSI 4800, 4801 and 4908 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **BEng: Architectural Conservation and Sustainability Engineering**
THAT Senate approve the deletion of the BEng: Architectural Conservation and Sustainability Engineering Streams A & B as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **GDIP Economic Policy**
THAT Senate approve the deletion of the Graduate Diploma in Economic Policy as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **MARCH**
THAT Senate approve the major modification to the MArch programs and the introduction of ARCH 5555 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **MPPA Collaborative Specialization in Climate Change**
THAT Senate approve the introduction of the Collaborative Specialization in Climate Change to the MPPA program as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **MA Women's and Gender Studies Collaborative Specialization in Accessibility**
THAT Senate approve the major modification to the MA in Women's and Gender Studies with Collaborative Specialization in Accessibility as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **DATA 5913**
THAT Senate approve the introduction of DATA 5913 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **PhD. Data Science, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence**
THAT Senate approve the major modification to the PhD in Data Science, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

- **GDIP European and Russian Studies**
THAT Senate approve the change in the Graduate diploma name to European, Russian and Eurasian Studies as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **MCS: Data Science Analytics and Artificial Intelligence**
THAT Senate approve the major modification to the MCS in Data Science, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **Undergraduate programs in Earth Sciences**
THAT Senate approve the major modification to the undergraduate programs in Earth Sciences as presented with effect from Fall 2025.
- **Undergraduate programs in Architecture**
THAT Senate approve the major modification to the to the BAS programs in Architecture as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

Co-op Policy

The Senate Co-operative Education Option Policy was updated regarding timelines, roles and responsibilities. A track-change copy showing the changes was circulated in advance to Senators.

It was **MOVED** (D. Hornsby, C. Viau) that Senate approve the revised Co-operative Education Policy as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

DUC Minor Modifications

As part of the affiliation agreement with the Dominican University College (DUC), Carleton University plays a role in curriculum and program review and approvals at Dominican University College. Minor modifications are approved by DUC and presented to Carleton's Senate for information. These minor modifications were circulated in advance to Senators via Appendix 5.

c) **Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC)** (E. Sloan)

Committee Chair Elinor Sloan presented two motions: one to approve a revised FPGA Faculty Board Constitution and the other to approve the dis-establishment of the Senate Library Committee.

FPGA Faculty Board Constitution:

In June of 2023 Senate passed a motion requiring all disciplinary Faculty Boards to revise their constitutions, to support the transfer of authority for graduate curriculum approvals from the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs to the disciplinary Faculties. The revised constitutions are brought to SAGC for review, and then to Senate for approval. In order to align the constitutions in terms of format, a template was developed and has been adopted by SAGC in its review. The FPGA Faculty Board Constitution has been revised in accordance with this template, reviewed by SAGC, and approved by the FPGA Faculty Board.

It was **MOVED** (E. Sloan, B. O'Neill) that Senate approve the Faculty Board Constitution of the Faculty of Public and Global Affairs, as presented.
The motion **PASSED**.

Library Committee:

The Clerk presented a motion to dis-establish the Senate Library Committee. Although the Senate Library Committee (SLC) has been in existence for over 70 years, SAGC noted that the committee's usefulness as an advisory body has steadily declined over the years as new mechanisms for more effective consultation with departments and faculty members have emerged. It was also noted that the link between SLC and Senate has also diminished, and that SLC meetings are poorly attended. To maintain and strengthen the connection between the Library and Senate, SAGC is also proposing that the Senate Review Committee's mandate be revised to include a review of the annual University Library Report, following a process similar to its review of the Enrolment Report and Operating Budget. SAGC members maintain that this would provide Senators with opportunities for deeper engagement with the University Library Report.

It was **MOVED** (E. Sloan, M. Haines) that the Senate Library Committee be dis-established and the Senate Review Committee's Terms of Reference be amended to include a review of a University Library Report annually prior to the report's presentation to Senate.

Discussion:

A Senator revealed that they had received an email from some members of the Senate Library Committee who objected to the decision to dis-establish the committee, noting

that the proposed solution with the Senate Review Committee would be a one-way engagement process that does not provide enough critical engagement with users. The Senator asked if there could be a renewal of the committee with a revised Terms of Reference. Another Senator suggested that perhaps this committee might be reimagined and continue its life outside of the Senate structure. Several Senators objected to the dis-establishment and asked for other solutions to be brought forward or more time to consider the future of the committee.

The Clerk reminded Senators of the robust discussion at Senate in January as a result of the Senate Review Committee's review of the Enrolment Report. This type of engagement can raise the profile of the Library to Senators and increase the connection to Senate, a connection that is lacking in the current structure.

Another Senator noted that creating another committee with the same representation would not necessarily yield better results. In their previous experience with the SLC, the Senator noted that it was difficult to achieve quorum, members were not engaged, and often did not understand their role. The Senator noted that there are now well established and effective avenues for engaging with the Faculties, and for addressing concerns directly with faculty members at the departmental level. The University Librarian also has opportunities to discuss issues with the Deans and the Provost.

The discussion came to a close and the Chair called the question.

The motion **PASSED**.

8. University Funding: A Primer (Provost)

The Provost provided a presentation to Senate on university funding, in response to a series of questions submitted in January by Senator Sean Burges. The presentation was divided into two sections: information on funding from the Ontario government, and how funding flows within the university.

Funding from the Ontario Government:

Questions from Senator Burges:

- How does enrolment at the University translate into funding flows from the Province?

- How much of the University's funding (nominal and percentage) from the Province comes in the form of a "block grant" and a "student enrolment contingent grant"?
- Can you please explain how enrolment-based funding from the Province to the University is calculated and under what envelopes it falls?
- Is there a limit to how much operating funding the University can get from the Province by increasing enrolments?

Operating grants from the government are set every five years through Strategic Mandate Agreements (SMA) that are negotiated individually with the Ministry. Carleton is currently finishing SMA3 (2020-25). SMAs assign weighted grant units (WGUs) to universities. These are calculated according to undergraduate enrolment levels with some negotiated growth, but they translate into a fixed funding amount.

Weighted Grant Units: each student is assigned a WGU value that varies according to program. Upper year undergraduate students are weighted more than lower-year undergraduates, as are students in Engineering and Science, since these programs require more resources to run. PhD students have the highest weighting.

Corridor Model: Enrolment corridors are set as part of the SMA negotiations. Planned growth is estimated for a 5-year period, and that growth is assigned a floor, a midpoint and a ceiling (+/- 3%). If the enrolment falls below the floor level, the university risks losing some government funding; if the enrolment rises above the midpoint level, the university may still collect tuition, but would receive no WGUs for those students.

The average Canadian university receives from its provincial government approximately \$16,000 for each full-time domestic student registered. Ontario provides the lowest grant per student in the country, at half the national average (\$8,000). Because of this funding deficit, Ontario universities are currently accepting 28,000 domestic students for whom they receive tuition but no provincial funding, since these student enrolments are above the corridor. The issue is exacerbated by the fact that more and more of these enrolments are in STEM programs which are more expensive to run. Unless the situation improves, it is estimated that by 2030, the number of un-funded students will grow to 100,000.

Carleton's 2023-24 operating grant was \$180,761,204.00 which breaks down to:

- 39.5% Core Operating Grant (corridor based)
- 7.4% Special Purpose Grants (enrolment based) (e.g. Indigenous support, mental health support)

- -1.4% International Student Recovery (claw-back on enrolment for International students)
- 54.5% Performance/Student Success Grant (corridor based) Based on criteria specified in the SMA such as graduate employment rate, experiential learning, graduate employment earnings, etc.

Funding Flows Within the University:

Questions from Senator Burges:

- How does the university calculate the funding that flows to a department/program on a per student enrolled in said department/program basis?
- How does the university calculate the funding that flows to a department/program for each student enrolled in a class delivered by that department/program?
- How does the funding flowing to an academic department/program translate into resources available for planning and delivering education and student enrichment?

Carleton uses an incremental budget model with a built-in Enrolment-Linked Budget Allocation (ELBA) mechanism. There are 11 Resource Planning Committees at Carleton (5 Faculties, 4 Vice-Presidents, President and Library). Incremental budgeting means that each Resource Planning Committee receives a base allocation of resources each year, based on historical patterns. If there is enrolment growth, that revenue is shared with Faculties using the ELBA formula:

- Net revenue = tuition + grant – scholarship cost
- 40% of year-over-year change in net revenue flows to Faculties. 60% is retained by the Central administration.
- Of the 40% to Faculties, 60% is attributed to course enrolments and 40% to student majors.

ELBA is distributed to Faculties, and the Deans then decide how to allocate these funds to individual units.

Discussion after the presentation focussed mainly on the Weighted Grant Unit calculations, in clarifying how these calculations are made and the assumption that some programs cost more to run. The Chair acknowledged that there is more depth and nuance to this topic, that is beyond the scope of this presentation.

The Chair thanked the Provost for the presentation and Senators for their engagement.

9. Motion from Senator Jody Mason

Due to lack of time, this motion was postponed to the next meeting (March 28, 2025).

10. Reports for Information

- a) Senate Executive Minutes (January 21, 2025)
- b) Senate Undergraduate Student Awards Committee – Report on New Awards

These items were not discussed.

11. Other Business

There was no other business.

19. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned (D. Howe, J. Mason) at 4:04 p.m.

Senate Questions – March 28, 2025

1) Question from Senator Edward Cyr

Why do we restrict the co-op option to students who maintain a certain CGPA average? Is a C+ CGPA student not deserving of this opportunity?

2) Questions from Senator Laura Madokoro

- a) Our department recently learned that starting in Fall 2025, the university plans to apply fees to deferred regularly scheduled exams. Could Senate please be provided with an explanation and rationale of this initiative, which seems highly inequitable? Given that deferred exams are often requested by students who are experiencing some kind of difficulty, applying a fee to this process is only going to exacerbate already stressful situations.
- b) Relatedly, could Senate be provided with an explanation of the rationale for online proctoring fees, which were recently transferred to individual units. Will these fees potentially be downloaded on to students?

3) Questions from Senator Jody Mason

In the Faculty Board Constitution template that was shared with Senators in June of 2024, faculties are instructed to list Standing Committees but not to “include their terms of reference”; however, it seems important for FB Constitutions to identify the terms of reference for these committees. Currently, the FASS Constitution includes these terms of reference for the important work of these committees (the Academic Planning and Curriculum Committee, for instance, which oversees the creation of new programs, program closures, program modifications, etc.).

- a) What are the reasons for wanting to strike such language from the revised FB Constitutions?
- b) On what grounds can SAGC require faculties to revise their Constitutions according to a SAGC-generated template?

4) Question from Senator Ashley Paiva

The faculty consistently tell us not to use any form of generative AI for any of our assignments, tests, exams, etc. When it comes to assignments, I've been told that professors, both faculty members and Contract Instructors, use an AI Checker which is just another form of AI. However, we also have been told that AI Checkers can make errors. If AI can make mistakes, why are Instructors using it to check our assignments, which if flagged are then sent to the Dean's office?

Senate Membership Ratifications

March 28, 2025

MOTION: That Senate ratify the following new Senate appointment, as presented, for service beginning immediately upon approval.

- James Brunet (Information Technology)

MOTION: That Senate ratify the following new Senate appointments, as presented, for service beginning July 1, 2025

Faculty Members (3-year term)

Computer Science: Ahmed El-Roby (acclaimed)	FED: Mostafa El Sayed (elected)
FPGA: Jeni Armstrong (elected)	FED: Cristina Ruiz Martin (elected)
FPGA: Sean Burges (elected)	FED: Niall Tate (elected)
FPGA: Achim Hurrelmann (elected)	FED: Winnie Ye (elected)
FPGA: Irena Knezevic (elected)	Science: Kevin Graham (acclaimed)
Sprott: Rebecca Renfroe (acclaimed)	Science: Inna Bumagin (acclaimed)

Undergraduate Students (1-year term) - all acclaimed

Ashley Paiva (FASS)	Isabella Alma (FPGA)
Emma Peirce (FASS)	Stella Duncan (FPGA)
Kuma Nyediin Buoy (FASS)	Nir Hagigi (FPGA)
Nathan Bruni (FED)	Nolan Giroux-Laplante (Sprott)
Xavier Haziza (FED)	Gabrielle Lachance (Science)

Senate Meeting Schedule 2025-26

Location: PK608 (Senate Room)

**All Senate meetings are from 2:00 – 4:00 pm unless otherwise specified*

September 26, 2025

October 31, 2025 – with Closed Session (no Fall Convocation)

November 28, 2025

December 12, 2025 - tentative meeting

January 30, 2026

February 27, 2026 – with Closed Session

March 27, 2026

April 24, 2026

May 29, 2026 – with Closed Session

June 19, 2026 – tentative meeting

Senate Executive Committee Schedule – Tuesdays at 11:00 am, unless otherwise indicated

Sept 16, 2025

Oct 21, 2025

Nov 18, 2025 – from 10:00 – 11:00 am

Dec 2, 2025 - may be held by e-poll

Jan 20, 2026

Feb 17, 2026

Mar 17, 2026

Apr 14, 2026 – from 10:00 – 11:00 am

May 19, 2026

June 9, 2026 – may be cancelled

MEMORANDUM

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

To: Senate
From: Julia Wallace, Chair of SCCASP
Date: March 28th, 2025
Subject: Regulation Changes 2025/26

For Senate approval

1. Continuous registration requirement, 0000-level course prohibition

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-2267: R-UG-Nursing effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: TBD-2267: R-UG-Nursing

2. Senate Policy on Social Work Professional Suitability

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations R-UG-SW: R-UG-Social Work Professional Suitability Policy effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: R-UG-SW: R-UG-Social Work Professional Suitability Policy

3. Continuous registration for Nursing added as an exception to regularly scheduled breaks

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1844: R-UG-2.1.2 Full and Part-time Study effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: TBD-1844: R-UG-2.1.2 Full and Part-time Study

4. BAS Design non-Honours removed, 13.5 residence for Nursing added

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1839: R-UG-2.2.2/3.4.1 Minimum Number of Residency Credits effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: TBD-1839: R-UG-2.2.2/3.4.1 Minimum Number of Residency Credits

5. Restrictions on credit added for programs offered by Sprott, BScN

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1868: R-UG-3.1.14 Restrictions on Credit for Certain Courses effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: TBD-1868: R-UG-3.1.14 Restrictions on Credit for Certain Courses

6. Adding Nursing Registration to Reg 3.1.3

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1853: R-UG-3.1.3 Absence from the University effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: TBD-1853: R-UG-3.1.3 Absence from the University

7. ACE regulation for BCyber

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-2308: R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Cybersecurity effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: TBD-2308: R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Cybersecurity

8. ACE regulation for BDS

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-2307: R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Data Science effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: TBD-2307: R-UG-3.2.7 Bachelor of Data Science

9. BPAPM advanced standing decision

Motion: That Senate approves the revisions to Regulations TBD-1378: R-ADM-Program-B.P.A.P.M. effective for the 2025/26 Undergraduate Calendar as presented.

Attachment: TBD-1378: R-ADM-Program-B.P.A.P.M.

For Information

1. *Attachment: GR_2526_MinorMods_2025Mar04*
2. *Attachment: UG_2526_MinorMods_2025Mar18*



DATE: March 21, 2025

TO: Senate

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

RE: 2025-26 Calendar Curriculum Proposals
Undergraduate and Graduate 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).

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 7 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. ACSE 4907

SCCASP approval: December 3, 2024

SQAPC approval: February 27, 2025

Senate Motion March 28, 2025

THAT Senate approve the introduction of ACSE 4907 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

2. MSc Management

SCCASP approval: January 21, 2025

SQAPC approval: February 27, 2025

Senate Motion March 28, 2025

THAT Senate approve the major modification to the MSc in Management and MSc in Management with Collaborative Specialization in Climate change and the introduction of BUSI 5988 with effect from Fall 2025.

3. INAF 5919

SCCASP approval: February 18, 2025

SQAPC approval: February 27, 2025

Senate Motion March 28, 2025

THAT Senate approve the deletion of INAF 5919 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

4. PHD International Affairs

SCCASP approval: February 4, 2025

SQAPC approval: February 27, 2025

Senate Motion March 28, 2025

THAT Senate approve the major modification to the PhD program in International Affairs and the deletion of INAF 6700 & 6907 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

5. MEng Engineering Practice

SCCASP approval: March 4, 2025

SQAPC approval: March 13, 2025

Senate Motion March 28, 2025

THAT Senate approve the major modification to the MEng Engineering Practice programs and the introduction of EWEX 5001 & 5002 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

6. EARTH 4910

SCCASP approval: March 4, 2025

SQAPC approval: March 13, 2025

Senate Motion March 28, 2025

THAT Senate approve the deletion of EARTH 4910 as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

7. PHD Communications

SCCASP approval: December 17, 2024

SQAPC approval: March 13, 2025

Senate Motion March 28, 2025

THAT Senate approve the major modification to the PHD comprehensive examinations in Communication as presented with effect from Fall 2025.

Senate Academic Governance Committee

Committee Nominations for Senate – March 2025

MOTION: That Senate ratify the nominee for the Senate committee indicated, for service beginning immediately upon approval.

- 1) Senate Review Committee
 - Cristina Ruiz-Martin (FED) (Faculty member)

MEMORANDUM

From: Senate Academic Governance Committee (SAGC)
To: Senate
Date: March 28, 2025
Subject: Revised Senate Review Committee Terms of Reference

On February 28, 2025, Senate approved a motion to dis-establish the Senate Library Committee and, at the same time, to revise the Terms of Reference for the Senate Review Committee (SRC) to include a review of the annual Library Report.

The Senate Academic Governance Committee is submitting for Senate approval a revised TOR for the Senate Review Committee, that includes this responsibility.

MOTION: That Senate approve the revised Terms of Reference for the Senate Review Committee, as presented.

Senate Review Committee

Terms of Reference

The Senate Review Committee reviews and reports to Senate annually on the Operating Budget Report ~~and~~ the Enrolment Report and the Library Report. In addition, the Senate Review Committee will respond to specific questions posed by Senate, based on the mandate of Senate.

Responsibilities

The committee will review and report annually on the finances of the university, ~~and~~ on student enrolment, and on the matters related to the University Library. In addition, Senate may request that the committee prepare reviews of various aspects of support for teaching, learning and research. When possible, these reports should be coordinated with presentations to Senate from the administration on these topics.

The Committee will gather and synthesize information from a broad range of sources, both internal and external to the University. The Committee will systematically review and summarize the information for presentation to Senate and provide a report to Senate. The Committee may also provide any advice to Senate regarding the question(s) being considered. The committee's reports will respect the constraints of confidentiality.

Membership

- A Chair elected by Senate and chosen from the elected faculty membership of Senate
- One faculty representative from each of the university's six-five Faculties ~~(including the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs)~~
- Two undergraduate students
- Two graduate students

Quorum and Voting

Quorum and voting are by simple majority

Reporting

The Committee reports to Senate

Review

These terms of reference will be reviewed every seven years or as needed.

Updated: September 25, 1998, January 28, 2005, May 26, 2016, January 29, 2021, March 28, 2025

~~Note: This Committee replaces the Senate Financial Review Committee.~~

MEMORANDUM

From: Senate Committee on Medals & Prizes
To: Senate
Date: March 28, 2025
Subject: Revised Senate Medals Policy

The Senate Medals & Prizes Committee met on February 27, 2025 to discuss revisions to the Senate Medals Policy. These revisions included a number of updates that were necessary due to FGPA restructuring and the suspension of Fall Convocation. The committee also agreed on the following additional changes:

- Removal of the Medals & Prizes Committee Terms of Reference from the policy, as per best practice
- Addition of a new Senate medal at the Master's level, for research projects. Previously, research essays/projects were included in the same Senate medal category as theses, which resulted in an unfair competition.
- Revision of criteria for evaluating candidates for university medals at the graduate level
 - Expansion of publication record to "record of research outputs such as publications, conference presentations, public engagement or other relevant activities"
 - Change of GPA from a primary criterion of evaluation to a secondary criterion, as GPA is less important at the graduate level than other deliverables.
 - For Master's students, the addition of a statement from the external examiner is requested (in addition to the statement from the supervisor) if the candidate has written a thesis.
- General clean-up (as indicated by track changes)

MOTION: That Senate approve the revised Senate Medals Policy, as presented.

SENATE MEDALS POLICY

1. General Medals Policy
- ~~2. The Senate Committee on Medals and Prizes~~
- ~~23.~~ Policy on Undergraduate Medals
- ~~3. Policy on Governor General's Medals at the Graduate Level~~
- ~~44.~~ Policy on University Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work
- ~~55.~~ Policy on Senate Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work

1. General Medals Policy

1.1 The Medals

Carleton University awards the following medals, when merited, at convocation.

Governor General's Medals Gold (Graduate students)
Governor General's Medals Silver (Undergraduate students)
Chancellor's Medal
President's Medal
University Medal [for Outstanding Graduate Work](#) – Doctoral
University Medal [for Outstanding Graduate Work](#) – Master's
University Medal - Undergraduate
Senate Medal for Outstanding Graduate Work - Doctoral
Senate Medal for Outstanding Graduate Work - Master's
Senate Medal for Outstanding Academic Achievement – Undergraduate

1.2 With the exception of the Governor General's Medals, a student will not be awarded more than one medal for the same body of work.

Commented [KM1]: Committee members agreed to remove the TOR from the policy

2. The Senate Committee on Medals and Prizes: Terms of Reference

Type of Committee: Standing Committee

Purpose: ~~The Senate Medals and Prizes Committee makes recommendations to Senate for the awarding of medals for academic achievement in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Senate Medals Policy.~~

Responsibilities:

1. ~~To recommend to Senate recipients of the following medals for academic achievement:~~

- ~~• Governor General's Gold Medals (graduate)~~
- ~~• Governor General's Silver Medals (undergraduate)~~
- ~~• President's Medal~~
- ~~• Chancellor's Medal~~
- ~~• University Medals (Graduate)~~
- ~~• University Medals (Undergraduate)~~
- ~~• Senate Medals for Outstanding Academic Achievement (Graduate)~~
- ~~• Senate Medals for Outstanding Academic Achievement (Undergraduate)~~

2. ~~To recommended to Senate new or revised medals regulations under the Senate Medals Policy.~~

Composition

1. Clerk of Senate, Chair
2. The Dean (or his/her designate) from each of the Faculties of Arts & Social Sciences, Public Affairs, Sprott School of Business, Science, Engineering and Design, and Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs.
3. Chair, Senate Committee on Student Awards
4. University Registrar, Secretary (voting)

Quorum and Voting:

Quorum and Voting are by simple majority.

Reporting:

The Committee reports to Senate.

Review:

These terms of reference will be reviewed every seven years, or as required.
Document Origin Date: Reviewed/Revised: September 25, 1998, January 28, 2005, May 26, 2016, June 18, 2021, August 5, 2021

23. Policy on Undergraduate Medals

Formatted: Normal

1. To be eligible for a medal or prize at graduation, a student must have completed a minimum of 10.0 credits towards the degree at Carleton. Students should not be denied consideration of medals on the grounds that they do not meet the residency requirements for (1) students who have studied on a university-sanctioned exchange program; (2) students who have studied at the University of Ottawa on exchange; and (3) students who are required by their program to study at another institution.

2. The Senate Medals for Outstanding Academic Achievement will be awarded to the top 3% of the graduating class¹ in each degree, subject to the requirement that, in all cases, the Overall GPA must be at least 10.60.² Students receiving a University Medal are excluded from consideration for a Senate Medal.

3. The initial ranking of students shall be on the basis of overall Cumulative Grade Point Average calculated only on the courses taken at Carleton for the degree.⁷
⁴This average is to be calculated to two decimal places, not rounded.

4.a. The recipients of the Governor General's medals at the undergraduate level will be selected from the graduates within that academic year. The medals will be awarded in the Spring to the top two graduates from the Winter and Spring classes and in the Fall to the top graduate from the Fall graduating class.

In the event of a tie, the Senate Medals & Prizes Committee reserves the right to consider additional criteria within the students' academic record(s) to select the recipient(s).

4.b. The Chancellor's and President's Medals will be awarded, when merited, at both the Spring and Fall ~~graduations~~ Convocation ceremonies.

The Chancellor's Medal(s) is awarded to the undergraduate student(s) in an Honours, 15-credit degree, or Major program in the graduating class ~~(see footnote #1)~~ with the highest overall average after the Governor-General's medalist(s). Multiple Chancellor's Medals will be given when there is a tie.

The President's medal is awarded to the undergraduate student in a 15-credit degree with the highest overall average in the graduating class ~~(see footnote #1)~~ after the Governor-General's medalist (if that medalist is from a 15-credit degree

¹~~The graduating class for the June convocation consists of all students who have applied to graduate in February, June or November and have met the graduation requirements for their degrees.~~

²~~Note that this change to the criteria for awarding Undergraduate Senate medals is effective from Fall 2021.~~

program). The Overall CGPA must be to two decimal points and, in case of a tie, the Major CGPA will be considered.

5. University medals at the undergraduate level shall be awarded to the top 1% of the graduating class in each Faculty, subject to the requirement that, in all cases, the overall GPA must be at least 10.6.³

6. Such additional guidelines as the Committee may, from time to time, find appropriate shall be brought to Senate for approval.

34. Policy on Governor General's Medals at the Graduate Level

The recipients of the Governor General's medals at the graduate level will be selected from graduates within that academic year. The medals will be awarded in the Spring to the top graduate from the Winter and Spring classes and in the Fall to the top graduate from the Fall graduating class.

45. Policy on University Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work

Criteria for the University Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work

Ph.D. Level

(i) Outstanding thesis as judged by the examining committee, the external examiner's report and recommendation, the supervisor's report and the report of the chair of the examining committee.

~~(ii) A grade point average of at least 11.0 in course work.~~

~~(iii) The candidate's record of research outputs such as publications, conference presentations, public engagement, or other relevant activities. The candidate's publication record.~~

~~(iiiiv) The recommendation of the Faculty Dean, of Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs.~~

~~In cases where candidates are equally ranked based on the quality of their thesis and research contributions, the highest CGPA in coursework will serve as the deciding factor.~~

Master's Level

³~~Note that this change to the criteria for awarding Undergraduate University medals was effective from Fall 2021.~~

(i) Outstanding thesis or research ~~essay work project~~. ~~Pass with distinction where this designation is used.~~

~~(ii) A grade point average of at least 11.0 in course work.~~

(iii) In programs where the degree is completed by course work only, a grade point average of 11.5 or better ~~in courses~~ ~~is would be~~ required. ~~This is would be equivalent to point (i) and (ii).~~

~~(iii)~~ Where the candidate has written a thesis or a research essay, a statement from the supervisor ~~and external reader~~ will be requested. Where the candidate has written a thesis, a statement from the external⁴ examiner will be requested.

(iv) The candidate's record of research outputs such as publications, conference presentations, public engagement, or other relevant activities. ~~record.~~

(vi) The recommendation of the ~~Dean of Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs and/or the~~ Faculty Dean.

In cases where candidates are equally ranked based on the quality of their thesis and research contributions, the highest CGPA in coursework will serve as the deciding factor.

56. Policy on Senate Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work

~~1. At its meeting of 27 March 1992, Senate approved the establishment of Senate Medals to recognize excellence in graduate work.~~

~~12. As at the undergraduate level, t~~he status of the Senate Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work is one level immediately below that of the ~~(existing)~~ two University Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work (Doctoral and Master's). The Senate Medals are meant to recognize runners-up for the University Medals.

~~23.~~ There are ~~two~~three categories of Senate Medals at the graduate level:

a. Type A: for students in programs with a research requirements, such as a dissertation or thesis, ~~research essay or project and;~~

b. Type B: for students who complete a research project or major research essay;
and

⁴ At the Master's level, an External Examiner is defined as a member of the committee from outside of the program.

~~c.b.~~ Type ~~CB~~: for students in ~~a~~ coursework-only Master's degrees.

~~34.~~ There are to be two Senate Medals of Type A (one Doctoral, one Master's) for each of the ~~following major disciplinary areas~~ ~~Faculties: (i) Arts and Social Sciences, (ii) Engineering, Architecture and Industrial Design (iii) Science and Computer Science, (iv) Public and Global Affairs and (v) Business.~~ When merited the Committee may recommend additional candidates for Senate Medals beyond the specified number.

~~45.~~ There are ~~up to~~ two Senate Medals at the Master's level of Type B for the University. The minimum requirement is a CGPA of at least 11.05 and a strong recommendation ~~from~~ the department.

~~5.~~ There are up to two Senate Medals at the Master's level of Type C for the University. The minimum requirement is a CGPA of at least 11.5 and a strong recommendation from the department.

~~66.~~ ~~As with the two University Medals, all Senate~~ All medals will be awarded in the Spring to the top graduate from the Winter and Spring classes and in the Fall to the top graduate from the Fall graduating class. Medals will be available for award at each of the Spring and Fall Convocations (February graduates being counted as part of Spring graduates) and be awarded only when merited in the opinion of the Senate Committee on Medals and Prizes and Senate.

~~77.~~ Given that the Senate Medals are meant to recognize runners-up for the University Medals, the criteria for the Senate Medals are identical to those for the University Medals (q.v.).

~~8.~~ The Senate Medals shall be available for award for the first time at Spring Convocation 1992.

~~89.~~ The candidate recommended to Senate by the Senate Committee on Medals ~~and Prizes~~ for the Governor-General's Medals at the Graduate Level will continue to be selected from graduates within that academic year. The medals will be awarded in the Spring to the top graduate from the Winter and Spring classes and in the Fall to the top graduate from the Fall graduating class.

SENATE MEDALS POLICY

1. General Medals Policy
2. Policy on Undergraduate Medals
3. Policy on Governor General's Medals at the Graduate Level
4. Policy on University Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work
5. Policy on Senate Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work

1. General Medals Policy

1.1 The Medals

Carleton University awards the following medals, when merited, at convocation.

Governor General's Medals Gold (Graduate students)

Governor General's Medals Silver (Undergraduate students)

Chancellor's Medal

President's Medal

University Medal for Outstanding Graduate Work – Doctoral

University Medal for Outstanding Graduate Work– Master's

University Medal - Undergraduate

Senate Medal for Outstanding Graduate Work - Doctoral

Senate Medal for Outstanding Graduate Work - Master's

Senate Medal for Outstanding Academic Achievement – Undergraduate

1.2 With the exception of the Governor General's Medals, a student will not be awarded more than one medal for the same body of work.

2. Policy on Undergraduate Medals

1. To be eligible for a medal or prize at graduation, a student must have completed a minimum of 10.0 credits towards the degree at Carleton. Students should not be denied consideration of medals on the grounds that they do not meet the residency requirements for (1) students who have studied on a university-sanctioned exchange program; (2) students who have studied at the University of Ottawa on exchange; and (3) students who are required by their program to study at another institution.

2. The Senate Medals for Outstanding Academic Achievement will be awarded to the top 3% of the graduating class in each degree, subject to the requirement that, in all cases, the Overall GPA must be at least 10.60. Students receiving a University Medal are excluded from consideration for a Senate Medal.

3. The initial ranking of students shall be on the basis of overall Cumulative Grade Point Average calculated only on the courses taken at Carleton for the degree. This average is to be calculated to two decimal places, not rounded.

4.a. The recipients of the Governor General's medals at the undergraduate level will be selected from the graduates within that academic year. The medals will be awarded in the Spring to the top two graduates from the Winter and Spring classes and in the Fall to the top graduate from the Fall graduating class.

In the event of a tie, the Senate Medals & Prizes Committee reserves the right to consider additional criteria within the students' academic record(s) to select the recipient(s).

4.b. The Chancellor's and President's Medals will be awarded, when merited, at both the Spring and Fall graduations.

The Chancellor's Medal(s) is awarded to the undergraduate student(s) in an Honours, 15-credit degree, or Major program in the graduating class with the highest overall average after the Governor-General's medalist(s). Multiple Chancellor's Medals will be given when there is a tie.

The President's medal is awarded to the undergraduate student in a 15-credit degree with the highest overall average in the graduating class after the Governor-General's medalist (if that medalist is from a 15-credit degree program). The Overall CGPA must be to two decimal points and, in case of a tie, the Major CGPA will be considered.

5. University medals at the undergraduate level shall be awarded to the top 1% of the graduating class in each Faculty, subject to the requirement that, in all cases, the overall GPA must be at least 10.6.

6. Such additional guidelines as the Committee may, from time to time, find appropriate shall be brought to Senate for approval.

3. Policy on Governor General's Medals at the Graduate Level

The recipients of the Governor General's medals at the graduate level will be selected from graduates within that academic year. The medals will be awarded in the Spring to the top graduate from the Winter and Spring classes and in the Fall to the top graduate from the Fall graduating class.

4. Policy on University Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work

Criteria for the University Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work

Ph.D. Level

(i) Outstanding thesis as judged by the examining committee, the external examiner's report and recommendation, the supervisor's report and the report of the chair of the examining committee.

(ii) The candidate's record of research outputs such as publications, conference presentations, public engagement, or other relevant activities.

(iii) The recommendation of the Faculty Dean. In cases where candidates are equally ranked based on the quality of their thesis and research contributions, the highest CGPA in coursework will serve as the deciding factor.

Master's Level

(i) Outstanding thesis or research project.

(ii) In programs where the degree is completed by course work only, a grade point average of 11.5 or better is required.

(iii) Where the candidate has written a thesis or a research essay, a statement from the supervisor will be requested. Where the candidate has written a thesis, a statement from the external¹ examiner will be requested.

(iv) The candidate's record of research outputs such as publications, conference presentations, public engagement, or other relevant activities.

(v) The recommendation of the Faculty Dean.

In cases where candidates are equally ranked based on the quality of their thesis and research contributions, the highest CGPA in coursework will serve as the deciding factor.

5. Policy on Senate Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work

1. The status of the Senate Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work is one level immediately below that of the two University Medals for Outstanding Graduate Work (Doctoral and Master's). The Senate Medals are meant to recognize runners-up for the University Medals.

2. There are three categories of Senate Medals at the graduate level:

- a. Type A: for students in programs with a dissertation or thesis;
- b. Type B: for students who complete a research project; and
- c. Type C: for students in a coursework-only Master's degree.

¹ At the Master's level, an External Examiner is defined as a member of the committee from outside of the program.

3. There are to be two Senate Medals of Type A (one Doctoral, one Master's) for each of the Faculties. When merited the Committee may recommend additional candidates for Senate Medals beyond the specified number.

4. There are up to two Senate Medals at the Master's level of Type B for the University. The minimum requirement is a CGPA of at least 11.0 and a strong recommendation from the department.

5. There are up to two Senate Medals at the Master's level of Type C for the University. The minimum requirement is a CGPA of at least 11.5 and a strong recommendation from the department.

6. All medals will be awarded in the Spring to the top graduate from the Winter and Spring classes and in the Fall to the top graduate from the Fall graduating class.

7. Given that the Senate Medals are meant to recognize runners-up for the University Medals, the criteria for the Senate Medals are identical to those for the University Medals (q.v.).

8. The candidate recommended to Senate by the Senate Committee on Medals for the Governor-General's Medals at the Graduate Level will continue to be selected from graduates within that academic year. The medals will be awarded in the Spring to the top graduate from the Winter and Spring classes and in the Fall to the top graduate from the Fall graduating class.

Motion Submitted by Senator Jody Mason

Senate – February 28, 2025

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

I move that any motion related to the closure of a program at the undergraduate or graduate level (major, minor, MA, or PhD program) be presented as a unique motion to Senate.



Senate Executive Committee

February 18, 2025

TB503C + videoconference

MINUTES

Attending: R. Gorelick, D. Hornsby, R. Renfroe, E. Sloan, W. Tettey (Chair), C. Viau

Regrets: N. Hagigi, J. Kundu, P. Rankin

Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

1. Welcome & Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 11:02 am.

A meeting binder containing the agenda and other meeting materials was circulated in advance to committee members.

It was **MOVED** (R. Renfroe, E. Sloan) that the agenda of the meeting of the Senate Executive Committee on February 18, 2025 be approved, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

2. Approval of Senate Executive Minutes – January 21, 2025

It was **MOVED** (C. Via, E. Sloan) that the Senate Executive Committee approve the committee minutes from January 21, 2025 as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

3. Review of Senate Minutes

It was noted that two sets of draft minutes were circulated for committee review: the Closed Session minutes from the Senate meeting on November 29, 2024, and the minutes from the Senate meeting on January 31, 2025.

The committee did not find any errors or issues with either set of minutes.

4. Motion submitted from Jody Mason

Committee members reviewed a motion for Senate submitted by Senator Jody Mason. The motion asks that any Senate motion related to closure of programs be presented as a unique motion (and not placed in an Omnibus motion). The motion also asks for such motions to be accompanied by a rationale including enrolment figures for the preceding 10 years, staffing information for the preceding 10 years and equity considerations related to the closure(s).

Senate Executive Committee members discussed the motion and agreed that the first section of the motion could move forward to Senate, but the second section which asks for accompanying rationale and data, is unnecessary, duplicates work already done, and potentially undermines the existing process and decisions made at both Departmental Board and Faculty Board levels. The committee agreed unanimously that the second section of the motion would need to be eliminated for the motion to move forward.

Motion:

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

I move that any motion related to the closure of a program at the undergraduate or graduate level (major, minor, MA, or PhD program) be presented as a unique motion to Senate ~~and, further, that the motion be accompanied with a fulsome rationale that includes:~~

- ~~1. enrolment figures for the preceding ten years~~*
- ~~2. staffing information for the preceding ten years (number of retirements, number of new hires, number of faculty on administrative or other type of leave)~~*
- ~~3. a note that considers equity considerations related to the closure (does the program offer courses or provide opportunities that are important to the university's commitment to equity?)~~*

The Clerk and Assistant University Secretary agreed to communicate the committee's decision to Senator Mason.

5. Draft Senate Agenda – February 28, 2025

A draft Senate agenda for the February 28th meeting was circulated in advance to the committee.

There were no additions or changes made to the closed agenda.

For the open agenda two changes were requested:

- The Provost is planning a fulsome presentation on budgeting and finances, in response to questions submitted by Senator Sean Burges. This presentation warrants its own agenda item, which would be placed after Reports as agenda item 8. The questions will be included in the binder with the other Question Period submissions, but in the meeting the Chair will indicate that these questions are to be answered in the Provost's presentation.
- The motion submitted by Senator Mason will be added to the agenda as agenda item 9, after the Provost's presentation item, provided the motion is edited according to the committee's directive.

It was **MOVED** (R. Renfroe, C. Viau) that the Senate Executive Committee approve the Senate agenda for February 28, 2025, as amended.

The motion **PASSED**.

5. Other Business

The recording secretary noted that due to technical issues with the audio/visual system in PK608, the next Senate meeting on February 28 will be in-person only. She also asked committee members to be ready to respond to a late-graduation approval e-poll, scheduled for March 5th.

6. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned (E. Sloan, R. Renfroe) at 11:32 am.

RE: Report of the Academic Colleague from the Council of Ontario Universities meetings

Dear Members of Senate,

I am providing my report for the February meeting of the Academic Colleagues. The evening session on February 11 included a land acknowledgment by Michele McIntosh (Trent) and a discussion on the graduate education landscape and innovations. Professors Suzanne Curtin (Brock) and Ben Bradshaw (Guelph) presented key developments and challenges in graduate studies across Ontario. Key topics included:

- The Principles of Graduate Student Supervision, developed by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS), with ongoing efforts to create professional development opportunities for supervisors.
- Expansion of graduate degree pathways, including micro-credentials, stackable micro-programs, and credit transfer initiatives, as well as exploring direct-entry PhD programs with off-ramps into Master's degrees.
- A pilot project for the Ontario Visiting Graduate Students Plan, which enables graduate students to take courses at other institutions without additional costs.
- The recent expansion of applied Master's programs proposed by colleges.
- Challenges in graduate student funding, recruitment, the international student cap, and artificial intelligence in research.
- Advocacy efforts related to graduate education, including the international student cap and funding for the Ontario Graduate Scholarship.
- The LEAD: Lifelong Education and Development online course, co-developed by myself and Dr. Alison Flynn (Ottawa), designed to enhance lifelong learning skills for personal and professional success.

On February 12, Academic Colleagues met to share institutional updates, including strategic planning efforts, budgetary constraints, administrative transitions, and collective bargaining issues.

COU President Steve Orsini provided an update on the Provincial Attestation Letter (PAL) allocation process for international students, the establishment of two new Working Groups on Life Sciences and Critical Minerals & Battery Technology, and COU's strategy for post-election advocacy. During the election period, COU will refrain from commenting on party platforms.

I also attended the Government and Community Relations Committee (GCRC) of the COU Board of Directors on January 30, alongside Jenn McArthur (TMU). Discussions focused on:

- COU's coalition-building with business and industry.
- Advocacy efforts emphasizing universities' contributions during economic downturns.

- Election planning and post-election advocacy strategies and Government Relations Officers (GRO) updates.
- An overview of Ontario Colleges delivered by Interim Colleges Ontario President Maureen Adamson.

The meeting concluded with a discussion of future topics, including:

- Revisiting the Scarborough Charter.
- The impact of U.S. government policies on DEI initiatives.
- Interdisciplinary collaboration within universities.
- Academic freedom, future of work, ethics in academia, and climate change & sustainability.
- Quality assurance processes and university governance.

The next Academic Colleagues meetings are scheduled for April 15-16, 2025 (hybrid format), followed by the COU Members meeting on April 17, 2025 (virtual format).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kim', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kim Hellemans, PhD
Assistant Professor, Department of Neuroscience
Associate Dean (Student Recruitment, Wellness & Success), Faculty of Science
Carleton University

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP REPORT

UNIVERSITY PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE 2024-25

Senate coordinates the nomination and election/acclamation of members to the *University Promotions Committee* on an annual basis.

Membership:

*For membership criteria, please consult the attached *Call for Nominations*.

FASS: (2 positions)

- Virginia Caputo, Full Professor, Sociology & Anthropology
- Micheline White, Full Professor, College of the Humanities

FED: (2 positions)

- Karim Ismail Full Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering
- Peter X. Liu, Full Professor, Systems & Computer Engineering

FPGA: (2 positions)

- Jonathan Malloy, Full Professor, Political Science
- Meredith Lilly, Full Professor, NPSIA

Science: (1 position)

- Farah Hosseinian, Full Professor, Department of Chemistry

Sprott: (1 position)

- Linda Schweitzer, Full Professor, Sprott School of Business



MEMORANDUM

To: All Full-Time Faculty at Carleton University
From: Kathy McKinley, Assistant University Secretary
Date: November 7, 2024
Subject: **Call for Nominations: Faculty members for *University Promotions Committee***

The Carleton University Senate is calling for nominations for full-time CUASA faculty members to serve on the *University Promotions Committee* (UPC) **for the 2024/25 academic year**.

To be eligible, faculty must currently hold the rank of Full Professor. Note that faculty members in the Teaching Stream are not eligible for the positions. Eight (8) elected positions are available as follows:

- Two members from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
- Two members from the Faculty of Public and Global Affairs
- Two members from the Faculty of Engineering & Design
- One member from the Faculty of Science
- One member from the Sprott School of Business

In addition to these 8 elected faculty members, the UPC consists of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) as Chairperson, and eight (8) other members chosen by the President. Faculty members chosen by the President are not eligible to run for the elected positions.

To submit a self-nomination for one of the eight (8) elected faculty positions, please send a statement of candidacy to Kathy McKinley, Assistant University Secretary (kathy.mckinley@carleton.ca) **at your earliest convenience and before December 6, 2024**. The statement of candidacy should include the name of the committee (UPC) on which you wish to serve, your name, rank, academic unit, and Faculty.

The meetings of the University Promotions Committee will take place **on April 9, 2025**.

Following the nomination period, candidates for contested positions will be elected by the tenured and tenure-track employees of the respective Faculties. If there is an insufficient number of candidates, the parties shall fill any vacancies at JCAA by mutually agreed appointment.

The procedural rules of the committee are in accordance with Article 10 of the Collective Agreement: <https://carleton.ca/hr/wp-content/uploads/CU-CUASA-2021-2024-Collective-Agreement-WEB.pdf>

Regarding eligibility for membership on this committee, please note the following general committee rules which are an excerpt of clause 10.11 of the CU/CUASA Collective Agreement:

(a) Members must not serve on any Tenure and Promotion committee in any year in which they have applied for tenure and/or promotion.

(b) Members of the Tenure and Promotion Committees at the Department, Faculty, and University levels cannot serve on the TPAC in the same academic year.

(c) The Presidential Officers of the Association and the CUASA Grievance Chair shall not serve on any DTPC, FTPC, UPC or TPAC.

(d) Any person taking part in the assessment of a candidate will disclose any relationship which could be a cause for a conflict of interest. The Committee shall determine whether or not the relationship constitutes a conflict of interest. In such decisions, the Committee will err on the side of caution. A person may request that a conflict of interest decision be made by JCAA.

(e) All committees established as part of the tenure and promotion review process must have at least one male and one female member and best efforts shall be made to reflect the diversity of the academic community these committees are representing.

Clause 10.11 contains additional provisions regarding the process and should be consulted for further information.

Thank you

Kathy McKinley

Assistant University Secretary, Carleton University

Kathy.mckinley@carleton.ca

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP REPORT

TENURE AND PROMOTIONS APPEAL COMMITTEE 2024-25

Senate coordinates the nomination and election/acclamation of members to the *Tenure and Promotions Appeal Committee* on an annual basis.

Membership:

*For membership criteria, please consult the attached *Call for Nominations*.

FASS: (2 positions)

1. Joanna Pozzulo, Full Professor, Department of Psychology
2. Adam Barrows, Full Professor, Department of English

FED: (2 positions)

1. M. John D. Hayes, Full Professor, Department of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
2. Mohamed Ibnkahla, Full Professor, Department of Systems & Computer Engineering

FPA: (2 positions)

1. Peter Andr  e, Full Professor, Department of Political Science
2. Fen Hampson, Full Professor, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs

Sprott: (2 positions)

1. Alan Cai, Full Professor, Sprott School of Business
2. Isaac Otchere, Full Professor, Sprott School of Business

Science: (2 positions)

1. James Mungall, Full Professor, Department of Earth Sciences
2. Joseph Bennett, Associate Professor, Department of Biology



MEMORANDUM

To: All CUASA Faculty from Carleton University
From: Kathy McKinley, Assistant University Secretary
Date: November 7, 2024
Subject: **Call for Nominations: Faculty members for *Tenure and Promotions Appeal Committee***

The Carleton University Senate is calling for nominations for CUASA faculty to serve on the *Tenure and Promotions Appeal Committee (TPAC)* for the **2024-25 academic year**.

To be eligible, faculty must currently hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor. Note that faculty members in the Teaching Stream are not eligible for these positions. Ten positions are available as follows:

- One delegate and one alternate from each of the five Faculties
- At least one member from each Faculty on the committee must be a Full Professor

The committee must be constituted of a majority of Full Professors to address any appeals of the denial of promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

To submit a self-nomination to serve on the *Tenure and Promotions Appeal Committee*, please send a statement of candidacy to Kathy McKinley, Assistant University Secretary (kathy.mckinley@carleton.ca) **at your earliest convenience and before December 6, 2024**. The statement of candidacy should include the name of the committee (TPAC) on which you wish to serve, your name, rank, academic unit, and Faculty.

Meetings of TPAC would generally be held in April (tenure) and May (promotion) in order to complete reports by April 30 for cases involving tenure and May 31 for cases not involving tenure.

Following the nomination period, candidates for contested positions will be elected by the tenured and tenure-track employees of the respective Faculties. If an elected delegate and their alternate are unavailable, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and the President of CUASA shall, acting reasonably and expeditiously, mutually agree on an appointee to serve on the TPAC.

The procedural rules of the committee are in accordance with Article 10 of the Collective Agreement: <https://carleton.ca/hr/wp-content/uploads/CU-CUASA-2021-2024-Collective-Agreement-WEB.pdf>

Regarding eligibility for membership on this committee, please note the following general committee rules which are an excerpt of clause 10.11 of the CU/CUASA Collective Agreement:

(a) Members must not serve on any Tenure and Promotion committee in any year in which they have applied for tenure and/or promotion.

(b) Members of the Tenure and Promotion Committees at the Department, Faculty, and University levels cannot serve on the TPAC in the same academic year.

(c) The Presidential Officers of the Association and the CUASA Grievance Chair shall not serve on any DTPC, FTPC, UPC or TPAC.

(d) Any person taking part in the assessment of a candidate will disclose any relationship which could be a cause for a conflict of interest. The Committee shall determine whether or not the relationship constitutes a conflict of interest. In such decisions, the Committee will err on the side of caution. A person may request that a conflict of interest decision be made by JCAA.

(e) All committees established as part of the tenure and promotion review process must have at least one male and one female member and best efforts shall be made to reflect the diversity of the academic community these committees are representing.

Please note that clause 10.11 contains additional provisions regarding the process and should be consulted for further information.

Thank you

Kathy McKinley

Assistant University Secretary, Carleton University